The Congregational Quarterly

Editor :
ALBERT PEEL, M.A., LITT.D.

Editorial Board :
REV. ARTHUR PRINGLE.
REV. W. B. SELBIE, M.A., D.D.
MR. HAROLD SHEPHEARD, M.A.

The Congregational Union of England and Wales is not responsible for opinions expressed in these pages, nor is the Editor responsible for the views of contributors.
THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY is published on the 20th of March, June, September, and December, each quarter, by the Publication Department of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. It may be obtained from the publishers at 2s. 6d. a copy (plus postage), or 10s. per annum post free, or from any bookseller at 2s. 6d.
All contributions (typewritten where possible) should be addressed to the Editor at 50, Newick Road, Clapton, E. 5, with stamped envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

Vol. II, No. 2 **APRIL 1924**

CONTENTS

[*For biographical sketches of the contributors, see p.* xv.]

EDITORIAL
JOHN HENRY JOWETT, M.A., D.D., C.H. . . JOHN LOOSMORE
IS IT POSSIBLE TO BE IN BUSINESS AND REMAIN A CHRISTIAN ? . . . . . W. T. CARTER
PAUL AS THE INTERPRETER OF JESUS . . C. H. DODD
JOHN HENRY NEWMAN . . . . A. T. S. JAMES
WONDER, WISDOM AND WORSHIP . . . A. LANDON
THE GENIUS OF CONGREGATIONALISM . . H. BULCOCK
CONGREGATIONALISM IN LITERATURE
A SPASMODIC POET . . . . . JAMES MOFFATT
THE SPIRITUAL MEANING OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM C. J. CADOUX
DR. WHYTE AS I REMEMBER HIM . . ROBERT MACKINTOSH
DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS—
THE AMERICAN SCENE . . . . J. EDGAR PARK
THE CONGREGATIONAL COUNTRY CHURCH
I . . . . . T. H. MAWSON
II . . . . . W. HADDON BEER
AN EXPERIMENT IN SOCIAL SERVICE . C. FLEMING WILLIAMS
G.A. . . . . GLADYS M. INGHAM
NONCONFORMITY IN THE MODERN UNIVERSITIES A. V. MURRAY
FOREIGN IMPRESSIONS AND REVIEWS . . W. BLACKSHAW
CURRENT LITERATURE :—By the EDITOR, Dr. W. B. SELBIE, Rev. J. G. MACKENZIE, M.A., Drs. J. P. NAISH, A. J. GRIEVE, Rev. C. H. DODD, M.A., Drs. R. MACKINTOSH, E. GRIFFITH-JONES, W. L. WALKER, Revs. W. MAJOR SCOTT, M.A., C. H. VALENTINE, M.A., H. C. CARTER, M.A., E. W. SMITH, M.A., and T. H. DARLOW, M.A.
SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.
PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

(Made and Printed in Great Britain.)

Messrs. T. & T. CLARK'S Announcements for Spring, 1924.

Two Additions to the "International Critical Commentary."

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. 12s. net.

By the Rev. Professor W. LOCK, D.D., Oxford.

HEBREWS. 14s. net.

By the Rev. Professor JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., Glasgow.

THE LOCAL COLOUR OF THE BIBLE.

Volume II.—I KINGS to MALACHI. 8s. net.

By CHARLES W. BUDDEN, M.D., and the Rev. EDWARD HASTINGS, M.A.

"By the term 'local colour' is meant the Oriental setting and background of the Bible, and it is a wealth of knowledge of the manners, customs and history of the Hebrew people, together with that of the geography of the land, that is here placed at the service of teachers of religion in all spheres. All Sunday School libraries will wish to extend their usefulness by adding these three volumes as they are issued. Meanwhile to the first of them we would offer a cordial word of welcome and appreciation."—*The Friend.*

THE DECALOGUE (The Warburton Lectures, 1919-1923). 7s. 6d. net.

By the Ven. Archdeacon R. H. CHARLES, D.D., D.Litt., LL.D., Westminster Abbey. Author of "Commentary on Revelation" (I.C.C.), "Studies in the Apocalypse," "The Adventure into the Unknown."

The subject is fully treated from three standpoints—the critical, the historical, and the practical. The Decalogue is interpreted on the spiritual and ethical lines already laid down in the New Testament, and its lessons are applied to the crying needs of our day.

THE BIRTH & GROWTH OF RELIGION. 6s. net.

By the Rev. Professor G. F. MOORE, D.D., LL.D., Harvard, Author of "A History of Religions" (International Theol. Library).

The average reader can easily understand this account of the origin and development of religion by one who is recognised as a leading authority on the subject.

REALITY IN BIBLE READING. 6s. net.

The Gain to Christian Faith from Critical Accuracy in the Ordinary Public or Private Reading of the English Bible, with more than Four Hundred Examples. By the Rev. FRANK BALLARD, D.D., M.A., B.Sc., etc. (Lond.). Author of "The Miracles of Unbelief," etc.

Knowledge of the Bible is for most people confined to what they chance to hear read in Church as lessons. It cannot but be admitted that only in a few cases is much made of these opportunities. Dr. Ballard shows how radical improvements may be effected.

INTERPRETATIONS NEW AND OLD. 7s. 6d. net.

By the Rev. A. S. GEDEN, D.D., late Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Literature, and of Comparative Religion, Richmond College. Author of "Outlines of Introduction to the Hebrew Bible," "Concordance to the Greek Testament" (with Dr. W. F. Moulton), translator of Professor Deussen's "The Upanishads."

The result of a lifelong study, these "Interpretations" record the author's intense conviction of the supreme moral and spiritual value for our own age of the writings of the Old and New Testaments, as well as their literary worth. The claim of the Bible is urgent for ever-renewed examination, and the reading of it never fails to provide fresh points of view and to illustrate and enforce old truths.

SONGS OF SORROW AND SONGS OF PRAISE.

(*Ready April.*) Probably 8s. net.

Studies in the Hebrew Psalter (The Hastie Lectures) by the Rev DUNCAN CAMERON, B.D., Assistant to the Professor of Hebrew, Edinburgh University. Author of "A First Hebrew Reader."

These studies deal with various aspects of the Psalter; its form, its teaching regarding the Covenant, the Law and the Sanctuary, its Songs of Sorrow and Songs of Praise, its use in the Jewish Church and in the Christian Church.

THE MYTHS AND LEGENDS OF INDIA: An Introduction to the Study of Hinduism.

By the Rev. J. M. MACFIE, M.A., Nasirabad. [*Ready May.*

38, George Street, EDINBURGH. **T. & T. CLARK** Stationers' Hall, LONDON.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Rev. JOHN LOOSMORE, Congregational minister, close friend of Dr. Jowett from College days.

Mr. W. T. CARTER, Managing Director, Keystone Clothing Company, Rugeley.

Rev. C. HAROLD DODD, M.A., Yates Professor of N.T. Greek at Mansfield College, Oxford, author of *The Meaning of Paul for To-day.*

Rev. A. T. S. JAMES, B.A., M.Sc., Congregational minister, author of *Twenty-five Years of the L.M.S.*

Rev. H. BULCOCK, M.A., B.D., Congregational minister, author of *The Translation of Faith,* etc.

Rev. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., D.Litt., Prof. of Church History in the United Free Church College, Glasgow. Translator of the N.T. ; has written widely on N.T. and literary subjects.

Prof. C. J. CADOUX, M.A., D.D., Prof. of New Testament in the United College, Bradford. Author of *The Early Christian Attitude to War,* etc

Rev. R. MACKINTOSH, M.A., D.D., Prof. at Lancashire Independent College since 1894.

Rev. J. EDGAR PARK, D.D., West Newton, Mass., U.S.A. Our American correspondent.

Mr. T. H. MAWSON, F.L.S., President of the Town Planning Institute. Landscape artist, whose plans have been followed in laying out Athens and Salonica.

Rev. W. HADDON BEER, Congregational minister, Whaley Bridge.

Rev. C. FLEMING WILLIAMS, Congregational minister, London.

Miss GLADYS M. INGHAM, B.Sc., Secretary of the London Association of Girls' Auxiliaries of the L.M.S.

Mr. A. V. MURRAY, M.A., Lecturer in Education, Selly Oak Colleges.

Rev. W. BLACKSHAW, M.A., B.Sc., B.D., Highgate.

Rev. E. W. SMITH, M.A., Literary Superintendent of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

Is Your Son Going Overseas?

DON'T LET HIM LAND WITHOUT FRIENDS.

The Colonial Missionary Society will see that he is met and linked up with the right kind of people.

WRITE AT LEAST TWO WEEKS BEFORE SAILING TO—

REV. A. G. SLEEP, Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, LONDON, E.C.4

The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

FOR the first time in the history of England a Labour Government is in office. It is generally admitted that it has made a good start, although inexperience has already caused mistakes, and Ministers have not yet learnt the increased importance that attaches to their utterances. The situation in the House of Commons is such that a great deal depends on the strategy of the party leaders; it is perhaps not too much to say that by the leadership of Mr. MacDonald on the one side and Mr. Asquith on the other the future existence of the Liberal Party may be settled. The Prime Minister may be able so to control his extremists that Liberalism may find its ideals adequately expressed by the Government, and the Liberal Party will disappear. This will inevitably happen if there is not more cohesion between Liberals than has been evident so far. If in every division in the House, the Liberal Party is found to be divided into three sections, one supporting the Labour, one the Conservatives, and one neither, the Party will soon be snuffed out.

* * *

WE have no desire to embarrass those who are working enthusiastically for Church Union between Presbyterians, Methodists, and Congregationalists in Canada—there are obstacles enough in the way already, although all the denominations are, by substantial majorities, committed to union. The supporters of the scheme claim that "Canada leads the world toward Christian Unity," and we rejoice with them in every step taken toward the day when all Christians shall be one. Some of the literature issued in support of the scheme inclines us, however, to enter a warning. Congregationalism in Canada is notoriously weak compared with the other denominations, and we must beware lest what is done in Canada be made a precedent, to be quoted against us in the future. The middle pages of a recent issue of the *Canadian Congregationalist* were occupied by an advertisement, in which the first two principles of the Union were thus stated:

1. The Creed of the United Church contains the "Doctrines of Grace" that made the Reformation.
2. No minister can be ordained in the United Church until he accepts the Church's Creed.

We believe that there is no better spiritual exercise than for each Christian to think out and write down periodically the things he most surely believes: it would clarify our thinking and strengthen our preaching did Christians in pew and pulpit make a practice of so doing. In these days when we live in a world that in its wisdom knows not God there may be much to be said for going further, for the preparation of creeds as declarations of faith. The man in the street has so strange, and often so false, an idea of what the Christian believes that it might be well for the Church to set forth its beliefs in modern terms.

The danger, of course, is that declarations of faith so often become religious tests. They tend to discourage research and progressive thought, to stereotype the expression of truth, and to encourage hypocrisy. To assent to, or "accept" creeds, reading into them one's own meaning, is dishonest: the Kingdom of God cometh not thus. "No minister can be ordained in the United Church until he accepts the Church's Creed" seems to us to contain elements of danger which are not removed by the answers made in the advertisement quoted, for we are told: "Before a minister can be ordained he must satisfy the examining body that he is in essential agreement with 'The Statement of Doctrine' of the United Church."

We wish well to the Union in Canada: the practical arguments in favour of it are very strong. We trust that in the Union our Congregational witness will be manifest in strength and vigour. For ourselves we believe that Congregationalism, in its insistence on the living Spirit rather than on the written form has a distinct contribution to make to the religious life of the world, and we trust we shall never cease to make it. Therefore it may be well if other Congregationalists write "without prejudice" over the Canadian negotiations.

* * *

FEW towns the size of Bedford, which the Council of the Congregational Union is about to visit, can boast so many names famous in history and literature, especially so many representatives of Nonconformity. First among them, of course, is John Bunyan, and no doubt many delegates will visit Elstow and try to see all the relics of Bunyan that still remain. We sometimes think that justice has never been done to Dr. John Brown's *Life of Bunyan*, which is far more than the recognized authority on Bunyan—it ranks very high among religious biographies.

Some generations after Bunyan, John Howard the philanthropist and prison reformer was linked very closely with the life of Bedford. It is often forgotten that Howard was a Congregationalist—we have heard quite respectable and eminent Congregational ministers refer to him as a Quaker—and it is fitting that one of our churches in Bedford should bear his name, as another does that of Bunyan.

In the nineteenth century Mark Rutherford brought Bedford to the notice of the world in volumes where the town's social and religious life is intimately described in the clear and pure English for which Rutherford is famous. Although he was expelled from one of our colleges for heresy, we like to think of Rutherford as a Congregationalist, and delegates to the Council could not do better than turn over the pages of Robertson Nicoll's *Memories of Mark Rutherford,* which Mr. Fisher Unwin has just published in book form (3s. 6d.).

* * *

Our post-bag testifies to the intense interest that is being taken in the discussion of the Moderatorial system. It is almost impossible to generalize from the letters received, but—if they are at all representative of opinion in the Churches—the feeling of our constituency may be thus described:

1. There is general appreciation of the work done by the Moderators in the last four years. Many, however, suggest that the Council ought to take this for granted and set to work at once on the *system.*
2. There are scarcely any proposals to abolish the system altogether and revert to the old method, or lack of method.
3. Almost every correspondent suggests that changes should be made in the present scheme, both in regard to the method of appointment and to the formation of a Provincial Council. Some would be satisfied with the scheme as originally formulated—i.e. with those sections (administrative areas and provincial committees) operating which have been a dead letter.
4. The suggested additional affiliation fee of 7s. 6d. per fifty members is exciting the liveliest interest, even in Churches that have not so much as heard that there were Moderators.

* * *

County Unions and Churches have, we believe, sent all manner of suggestions to Headquarters, and the Chairman of the Council deserves our sympathy, for he appears to be in for a difficult time. All this discussion, however, is a sign of life and health, and there is no doubt that from it a sound policy will ultimately emerge.

It has to be recognized that with every increase in denominational funds there should be increased vigilance on the part of Churches and Church members. It is not always that we find ourselves in sympathy with the pastor of Spurgeon's Tabernacle, but his recent warning about endowments was neither unreasonable nor unnecessary. If a denomination acquires considerable funds for the support of Churches, the maintenance and superannuation of ministers, and the upkeep of its official organization, there must be the most vigorous life to prevent such funds from becoming a danger and a snare. If, after our colleges have enticed inferior youths to enter the ministry—often nursing them until they can pass an entrance examination—the denomination is to ensure them a minimum stipend and superannuation at sixty-five, Congregationalism is not going to secure the alert, virile, learned ministry, of which it was once proud, and without which it cannot maintain its effective witness.

It is therefore all to the good that a time of expansion in our denominational funds coincides with so much evidence that the old belief in freedom is not dead.

* * *

THE Moderatorial problem will never be solved unless it is recognized that the scheme now in our *Year Book* is a compromise between two conflicting, if not incompatible, ideals. On the one side was the view that nine men could usefully serve the Churches as advisers and counsellors in sacred things, quite apart and distinct from County and administrative officials ; on the other was the view, pressed by Mr. Viner, that it is not possible in Church work to distinguish between spiritual and administrative, and therefore that the Moderators must serve their areas in as full and varied a way as do the secretaries of the large County Unions—Lancashire, Yorkshire, and London. It was insistence on the latter point of view that resulted in the clause about administrative areas—a clause which, lacking the enthusiastic support of many, has never been put into operation

Is it not necessary that the Council should first decide which of these ideals is our aim and which best serves the needs of the time ? If the second, the scheme now outlined by the Lancashire Union seems to provide a basis for discussion ; if the first, the inoperative clause should be cancelled. The experience of Moderators and County Union Secretaries would be valuable in coming to this decision. Do they not find it impossible to draw a line between spiritual and administrative in their work ? Almost as soon as they begin to consider the work of the ministry in any Church, are they not faced with questions of ways and means, stipend, and possible grant from County Union and Central Funds ?

What has been written about the danger of accumulated funds is not without its bearing on the method of appointing Moderators. When all has been said that can be said about the folly of "the old Independency"—and it is agreed that it was (and is) at times carried to lengths that destroyed fellowship and prevented progress—the fact remains that Congregationalism is built upon the local Church, through which the Church Universal can find expression. The nearer we are to the local Church, the more we are in line with our distinctive principle. It seems to us therefore that the Congregational, and the constitutional, way is for the Moderator to be appointed by the Province he is to serve. There is no reason why the National Assembly should not recognize, or approve, or ratify, the appointment, but the Moderator should be responsible, not to it, but to his Province. This would go far to meet the widespread fear that the Moderators may be simply the servants of Headquarters, existing to impose the policy of officials.

* * *

THERE are marked differences of opinion, and the way out does not seem clear. Whether a Council of from two hundred to three hundred can beat out an agreed policy in open debate is doubtful: probably, after the matter has been well ventilated, it might be well to refer it to a committee of twenty, representing all opinions, with an instruction to bring an agreed report in May. In any case, whether the decision be made in March or in May, let it be such as leaves no discontented minority. Whatever conclusion is reached, let it have the united backing of the whole of the denomination. We have recently appointed a leader whom we trust, one who, we believe, can render splendid service. Let us not make his task difficult by division at this time, but having determined our policy, let us loyally carry it out.

* * *

THE Moderatorial scheme is so bound up with finance that surely this is the time when the relation of the County Unions to the National Union in regard to finance should be considered. The only satisfactory way in which Congregational finances can be put on a sound footing is by a unified appeal to the Churches. At present the appeals are separate—and sometimes conflicting. The London Union presses for an affiliation fee of at least 5s. for fifty members, while the national affiliation fee has been doubled, and last autumn Mr. Berry's appeal for a special collection coincided with a special appeal of the London Union for its Jubilee Fund. Is it impossible for the National and County Unions to work out a scheme during the present year whereby they make one appeal to the Churches (to be divided in agreed proportions), so that for 1925 a sound system of denominational finance (including

provision for the Moderatorial or other system as determined) may be established ?

* * *

NOT the least interesting part of our correspondence during the quarter has been that relating to Congregational Colleges. There is evidently a strong feeling, especially among laymen, that the denomination should grip the nettle and deal with this problem at once. It certainly seems strange that, with all the talk about Christian union, so little is done to effect economies, increase efficiency, and develop fellowship by uniting colleges belonging to the Free Churches. Some time ago, when proposals for co-operation or amalgamation between our colleges in Bradford and Manchester were under consideration, it was suggested that while there was much to be said for an Independent College on either side of the Pennines, there was nothing to be said for a Congregational College at Manchester, a Baptist College in the same city, a Congregational College at Bradford, and a Baptist College at Rawdon a few miles away. The suggestion that steps be taken to approach the two Baptist Colleges with a view to union was treated as a revolutionary proposal utterly beyond the wit of man to compass. Why should it be so, if the two denominations have so much in common ? All the talk about union is merely " hot air " if we cannot, in practice, begin to unite, and institutions for the training of the ministry might, should, and could, lead the way.

In Cambridge we have Presbyterian, Congregational, and Wesleyan Colleges, and probably Regent's Park Baptist is to be transferred there ; in Bristol Baptist and Congregational Colleges—neither, we imagine, overcrowded—stand not far from each other. We must show the reality of our professions about re-union by setting our minds and hands to the solution of this problem, and we must all be prepared to make some sacrifices for the common good.

* * *

THERE have been so many requests from our readers that the number of pages we devote to " Current Literature " should be increased that we have this quarter, without reducing the number of articles, given sixteen extra pages to reviews. This means we are living on our capital ! We hope those whose wishes we are meeting will help to secure such an increase of circulation as will justify this extravagance.

JOHN HENRY JOWETT, M.A., D.D., C.H.

THE name and fame of Dr. Jowett are enshrined in the hearts of all our Churches. They knew him to be a very great preacher, one of the few of our time. But he was a greater man. The splendid work he has done in Newcastle, Birmingham, New York and London loudly proclaims his greatness. He had it in him to be a great explorer or organizer, as was revealed by his gigantic and successful Digbeth Institute scheme. As Chalmers "warmed the heart of Glasgow by his preaching," so Jowett, according to the *Newcastle Daily Chronicle*, "purified and sweetened the business life of the Tyneside." The health-giving influence of "Carr's Lane" was never more vigorous than during his ministry. In New York and London he walked in his strength on the new waves of internationalism and received from King George an unofficial commission to work for the safety of the ship of unity. He gave much and learned much at "Fifth Avenue," and he did more than one man's share to bring the United States to our aid in the most critical period of the war. At Copenhagen and at home he rendered powerful assistance in the maintenance of the endangered peace of the world. And he envisaged and worked for the more comprehensive Church of the future.

One day forty-one years ago, when Jowett had preached in the sermon class at Airedale College, Dr. Fairbairn said to the hypercritical students: "Gentlemen, I will tell you what *I* have observed this morning: behind that sermon there was a MAN." The learned Principal saw the flower in the bud. That "man" grew in wisdom and in stature and in favour with all the Churches, becoming the mighty man whom we now mourn, who with dwindling strength did a full day's work in less than a full day.

Jowett arrived at Airedale College at the age of eighteen with an instructed ambition to be a public speaker. In his boyhood his wise father frequently encouraged him to visit various towns around Halifax to listen to great orators like Disraeli, Bright and Gladstone. The following day the lad would declaim in his attic from the newspaper report the speech which he had heard on the previous night. Thus early he formed his mind to public speech and bent his ambition towards becoming a member of Parliament.

Under the captivating ministry of Dr. Enoch Mellor his passion to preach was born, and it was nurtured and emboldened by the influence and enthusiasm of Dr. Fairbairn and Dr. Duff. Then, as "Brown Scholar" at Edinburgh University, he came into the searching, burning light of Dr. Alexander Whyte's preaching and tried his wings in the students' evangelistic campaign of Professor

Henry Drummond. Thus wonderfully God wrought for the formation, awakening and culture of Jowett's gifted, sensitive, modest and valorous nature.

Professor J. Hope Moulton once said to the writer that Dr. Jowett possessed astonishing insight into the truths of Scripture and skill to tell efficiently to others what he saw. Moulton was a seer. The two passions of Jowett's life were to understand the Scriptures and to persuade men of the life, beauty and power therein promised.

His insight was truly astonishing. With the greatest ease he could turn his bright lamp upon the hidden things of Holy Scripture, wrest the truth from ancient, Oriental figures and symbols, and make it simple, beautiful and seductive to Western, modern minds. He saw that life is beautiful; he disciplined and chastened himself to enjoy it; and he panted to help men to understand and to respond more intensely, more fully and more nobly to the throb of life in Christ. His insight was at home in the Bible. He was very intimate with Shakespeare, Wordsworth, Emerson and Bunyan, but he was married to the Bible. The offspring of that marriage gave him great delight, wisdom and power. Biblical Criticism was to him not an Evangel to be preached, but both an eye-salve to clarify his own vision and a clarifying chemical to be cast into the waters in which he searched. The precious things which he found he laboriously marshalled into clear, vivid and fascinating outline. His expert companions in all this were Joseph Parker and Alexander Whyte. Their portraits were always near to him and were easily seen by him, to the last, from his sick bed.

What a wide range his insight enjoyed! His library bears witness to his keen interest in what men think and feel. No school of thought, no new fashion in thinking, was foreign to him. He took all theories and experiments home, weighed them and tested them for the gold of truth. Was there ever such a reader of newspapers? Wherever he went one of his first actions was to buy the local papers that he might discover what people were thinking and feeling. He thirsted to know people, to see where they stood and to learn how they were to be attracted into the kingdom of divine grace. Real men, men who were interested in life, men who knew sorrow and sin, heard him gladly, responded to his appeal, and ate the Bread of life which he broke for them.

His skill to tell efficiently what his insight captured was the result of hard work. Through all the years he took pains to gain the mastery over words, and even his flexible, bell-like, clarion voice was such a perfect instrument because of long and careful training. He also loved the external world, observed it in all its moods and reflected on what he saw and heard. All beauty and health he claimed for Christ's kingdom. Thus he stored up impressions which he kept sharp, clear and ready to leap up at his

call to illumine his thought or to commend it to others. He became an artist in the sense that he had cultivated the skill to say things in the style both worthy of his theme and fitted to carry the truth home and make it fertilize the minds and hearts of his hearers. He could make a beautiful vehicle for heavenly thoughts, so that, as they came riding by, you might with wonder arrest its progress in order to receive something of its gladsome load. He crowded in beauty everywhere and made public worship "as interesting as a theatre," as one collarless man remarked on leaving a service. Jowett was wont to say in recent years that if he had his time over again he would appeal more strongly to people's emotions and employ them as tides to carry men into the kingdom of God.

He burned his candle fiercely in the wasting wind of tumultuous public appreciation. So thrilling was his work that he tried to fence himself about and shut himself in from people, as Canon Liddon had done, that he might possess a quiet place in his own mind in which he could calmly pursue his research. He lived aloof from men not because he was self-conscious or lacking in sociable qualities. He was the most self-forgetful, brotherly and approachable of men. But he dreaded sentimentality and hated sensationalism, and he recognized that his work required him to be something of a recluse.

He was a great man—great in his habit of prayer, in his humility, loyalty, generosity and tenderness. His sense of humour, a truly wonderful gift inherited from his mother, was his closest companion and never tiring servant. It made him quick to see any incongruities in life or behaviour and kept sanity in all his thoughts. He often saved the situation by his ready wit. One Sunday at "Carr's Lane" a man walked up the long pulpit stairs during the sermon and announced to Dr. Jowett: "I am Judas Iscariot." "Oh! Take a seat," replied the preacher, and resumed his discourse, leaving it to one of the deacons to fetch the intruder down. Sometimes, by a startling, "undignified" action he would dispel gloom or dulness and produce the sunshine of cheerfulness and comradeship. How he revelled in conversing in the rich Yorkshire dialect with any intimate "Tyke" who, like himself, loved the old tongue! To see him in his own home entertaining a party of children was to enjoy a feast of fun and ingenuity.

His heart and his home were treasure-houses full of rich wares for export. He was greatly blest in his wife and in his dearly loved adopted daughter. He rested in this bower of happiness, knowing that it was part of the grace of God given for his peace and work. That work, from first to last, dominated all his powers and possessions. Only three days before he passed beyond the veil he said to the present writer: "After my recent experience of God I have great things to tell men, things men want to hear."

JOHN LOOSMORE.

IS IT POSSIBLE TO BE IN BUSINESS AND REMAIN A CHRISTIAN?

The question was put to me by a Socialist friend during a discussion upon the anomalies of our present industrial system. I could not answer it; there was no ready answer to it possible. Yet the question is a challenge imperatively demanding an answer. In its blunt, provocative way it raises an issue which more and more every day is confronting Christian men in industry and commerce. Can the essential demands and requirements of modern business be made conformable to the Christian ethic?

The experience of one whose introduction to the business world is of comparatively recent date may be of value. Before the war I was an onlooker; to-day, five-sixths of my waking moments are engrossed in business affairs and business problems. I came into business with well-defined ideals; few of them remain what they were. In every case they have lost much of the amorphous sentiment that envelopes the theoretical view; they have become vital and crucial. And deep in my mind is the doubt whether in the ultimate they can ever be realized without the sacrifice of what hitherto have been regarded as the basic conditions of business prosperity.

I am not alone in my dilemma. The mind that approaches business fresh and untutored in its mysteries sees something that escapes the attention of those grown accustomed to its conditions and circumstances. And it is impossible to experience business for the first time in this way without becoming acutely aware of the ferment of doubt arising in the minds of business men on every hand. The air is clamant with the unrest of the workers; one needs to be within another circle of economic interest to realize that this unrest is not confined to the worker. It has spread to employers themselves. The old complacency has gone. The Ricardian gospel is being challenged in the consciences of its own adherents. A prosperous business man, a stalwart of Nonconformity and of undoubted probity of life, avowed a few years ago, on the one hand, that no worker had the right to more than his services would fetch in the open market, and, on the other, that no business could be held to be successful that was paying less than a 20 per cent. dividend. That type of mind is rapidly becoming an anachronism. I do not mean that the principles and axioms in question have been universally and openly repudiated; I do mean that there is no longer in this country any real or rigid acceptance of the doctrine they reflect. There are still a vast number of em-

ployers whose practice it is to pay in wages what they are compelled in law to pay and not a penny more, who place no limit in their minds upon the profits their businesses shall earn; but there are few who would be prepared to defend their avarice upon Christian grounds. The development of moral consciousness, stimulated not a little by the rising tide of discontent amongst the workers, has indeed swept a great many employers a step further still. It has convinced them of the inequity and injustice of the older dogmatic economics. It has done more: it has aroused in them a sense of personal responsibility. Inwardly they feel convicted of the wrong. There is a sense of guiltiness in participation in a system which tolerates such injustices. But they cannot see how to put the matter right; they cannot say where the line is to be drawn. If wages are to be paid, what should those wages be? If dividends are to be made, what is the maximum that can be fixed without violation of Christian justice? It is not too much to say that unrest in the labour world has now its counterpart in the disturbed complacency and shattered contentment of employers in every industry. This unrest may not altogether be apparent; it is neither vocal nor dramatic in its manifestation; but it is there nevertheless. And seen aright it is one of the most hopeful signs of the day.

If evidence is needed of this awakening consciousness to the manifest wrongs and injustices involved in our present commercial and industrial system, one has only to point to the large and steadily increasing number of Co-partnership, Profit-Sharing, Pensions, Welfare and other similar schemes which have been developed during the last few years. Objections have been raised by political representatives of Labour to all schemes of this character on the grounds that they tend to compromise with the worker on a lower level of justice than that to which he is entitled—in a word, that they are bribes to secure his continued allegiance to a system under which he can have no hope whatever of adequate reward or security. They represent the price the employer is prepared to pay for industrial peace. This accusation may be true in the case of a few unprincipled employers who are using these schemes as an insurance against interference from the workers; in the main, nevertheless, it is mistaken. The unprincipled employer as a rule is not quite so far-sighted; he is too deeply absorbed in his self-seeking to take such a long view of the matter. Most of the Co-partnership and Profit-Sharing schemes of which I have personal knowledge have resulted from the recognition by employers that the scales have become too heavily loaded on the one side and that the balance must be adjusted in some form or other. They are, in fact, a witness to the mental disturbance to which I have referred.

It would not be difficult to attest this fact by a number of

instances. One of the most recent, as it is one of the most carefully thought out, schemes of Profit-Sharing—that of Messrs. Rowntree—gives unqualified approval and encouragement to membership of Trade Unions; profit-sharing in this instance is very definitely a sincere attempt to secure equitable treatment as between labour and capital employed within the business. The same spirit has animated most of the Co-partnership and Profit-Sharing schemes initiated during the last few years. A remarkable example of this new awakening came to my notice last year. A very prosperous millowner in Yorkshire, a man who has won success by dint of energy, initiative and ambition, and is still in the prime of life, startled his employees three years ago by announcing that a very considerable share of the profits made during the year would be immediately distributed to them in the form of cash bonuses. Wisely or otherwise, he had carefully preserved his intentions until the moment of announcement. The effect was surprising. His word was first doubted, and, after the actual distribution of money, his motive distrusted. Labour agitators worked upon that distrust to such an extent that, within a few months, difficulties arose which led to a strike, a partial lock-out, and finally the temporary closing of the mills. Bitterly disillusioned, the proprietor turned, as he then thought for ever, from any idea of giving participation to his workpeople in the successes of the business. Yet within two years he was eagerly studying Co-partnership and Profit-Sharing schemes with a fixed determination of ridding his mind and conscience of what had become an intolerable sense of injustice.

These instances will naturally give rise to the questions: "Is there not evidence already that it is possible to put Christian principles into practice in business? Have you not already indicated the fruits of the Christian mind working towards the solution of a difficult economic problem?"

It is here that we come to the root of the matter. Unfortunately, the problem is not quite so simple as that. The evidence of goodwill so far manifested is a cause for rejoicing; it is an earnest of better things to come. It does not touch, however, the core of the trouble, and for this reason, that the chief moral problems arising in business, so far as they involve individual judgment and decision, concern not so much the disposal of profits when earned as the actual making of those profits. It is an easy matter to be just when the money is there; it is an entirely different thing when the money has to be made. A brigand can rise to the heights of Christian charity in the sharing of his booty, but the just distribution of ill-gotten gains does not make him a Christian. And all the Co-partnership and Profit-Sharing schemes in the world will not help the employer, striving to translate the spirit of Christ into business practice, to reconcile principles that are hopelessly conflicting. The one may

be an anodyne for the other; it can never be its solvent. A large employer of labour recently told me that he was determined to leave at his death neither debts nor assets. It was his conception of a true Christian ending. In pursuance of this decision he was already divesting himself entirely of his rights in the business which owed its inception and prosperity to his foresight and industry. A large proportion of his shares he was handing over to his employees. About the idealism inspiring this act of denial there can be no dispute, but such acts cannot provide any real solution to the problem which lies deepest in the heart of this economic tangle of to-day—the problem of introducing moral values into transactions which are governed by the pitiless laws of competition. Dividing the ownership only spreads the responsibility; it does not do away with it. And moral sentiment has no place to-day in buying and selling, the twin functions of modern industry. These are motived by selfishness, and not sacrifice; by the instinct of acquisitiveness, and not by the spirit of love; by the spirit of Mammon, and not by the spirit of Christ. It is precisely upon these prosaic fields of business routine and practice that the great battles of conscience have still to be fought.

The question put to me by my friend was a personal one. It was clear and direct. In his mind I knew there were no extravagant views as to the exact interpretation of the word Christian. He could easily have quoted a score of Christ's sayings which, interpreted literally, would render any participation whatever in business as at present organized demonstrably impossible for the Christian. But there was no need for him to do that. There are certain aspects of Christ's teaching which for all purposes are sufficiently clear and emphatic. They are neither fantastic nor impracticable. Outside business we freely admit them as attainable ideals. "Love your neighbour as yourself"; "Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you." Implicit in all these fundamentals of Christ's teaching is man's personal responsibility for his own actions in regard to their effect upon the welfare of his fellows. The immediacy or otherwise of that effect does not enter into the question. If the effect is or can be foreseen, there can be no escape from the responsibility. The question then becomes simple. Is it possible to obey the governing rules of business as expressed in the present competitive system and still maintain the integrity of Christian discipleship? Can a man run a business successfully without acquiescence in principles which lead, within certain knowledge, to human distress and misery? It is obvious, of course, that it ought to be possible to follow Christ and not deny Him in the critical tests of life, but is it possible to do it in business and not end in the Bankruptcy Court? Let us see.

The one thing that always seems to be forgotten in discussions

upon this subject is that business is almost exclusively a matter of £: s. d. Sentiment rarely enters into it. A great deal has been written of recent years, especially by the "service" school of business men, to prove the opposite. In the final analysis, however, the statement remains true. That is not to say that a good deal of fine human sentiment does not exist in many businesses between employers and employees, or that the same spirit of goodwill may not cement the relationship between a firm and its customers. A business is all the better, and in most cases all the more prosperous, for the possession of such sentiment and goodwill, but alone these are not sufficient to keep it from financial failure. The test of a firm's success is its ability to balance its budget, and the precise value of goodwill and sentiment in this calculation is known to every business man who has had to submit his balance sheet to his banker. A business is doomed which cannot make gains computable in solid, tangible assets. Sentiment and goodwill may be an element in the making of those gains, but they will not and cannot figure largely in the final accounts.

I have spoken of buying and selling as the twin functions of modern business. There is, of course, a third, where a business is engaged not merely in buying and selling but in manufacturing also. Into all these activities there enter strong personal elements of skill, intelligence, foresight, goodwill, and so on. They cannot therefore be regarded as entirely mechanical in their operation. They become invested with human energy, knowledge and will. Before the advent of modern industrialism, as expressed in specialization and mass production, these human factors were paramount. The laws of supply and demand operated then as they do now, but with a difference. Then the demand was real—it was concerned mainly with the physical needs of life: now the demand has to a large extent to be created—it often concerns things totally unnecessary to life. One of the resulting changes is that skill and service have come to count less and price has come to count more in the manufacture and marketing of an article. The *raison d'être* of business lies in the elemental needs of the community—food, clothing, etc; the non-essentials are but the by-products of our energy. Luxuries represent, or should represent, the surplus of human energy after the fulfilment of essential human needs. There is indeed a very real sense in which we can only buy luxuries at the expense of necessities. The tendency of modern industrialism, nevertheless, has been to overload the economic structure, to draw more and more energy and skill away from the production of the essentials to that of the non-essentials of life. And the important point to observe is that this dispersal of human energy over a wider (and in parts a totally unnecessary) field has made price and not quality the governing factor in the selling of every article, whether raw or

manufactured. Quality is rapidly vanishing or is becoming the luxury of the few.

These tendencies are clearly and dramatically reflected in business life to-day. Competition has become the primary driving force of commerce and industry: and it is competition largely confined to the matter of price. Moreover, it is competition arising from without and not from within. It has ceased to be a laudable desire to excel arising from pride of craft or love of service; it is an iron compulsion to which a business must bow. It is rivalry, but in what respect? Quality? In a minor degree. Service? Yes, in some respects. But above everything it is rivalry in price. And that, in a word, is the real crux of the matter.

I want to try and show how this is operating and how, in my opinion, it is becoming more and more a menace to the maintenance of Christian principles. Look for a moment at competition, not as an abstract economic theory, but as a living fact in the lives of men responsible for our industries and commerce. Unless he is fortunate enough to have a speciality, in the production and marketing of which he has unchallenged and possibly exclusive legal rights, a business man will usually find himself in strict competition with others in similar circumstances and producing, in all but unessential details, precisely similar articles. His ambition may be to give service in the fullest humanitarian sense. He is watchful and painstaking in regard to the quality of the goods he sells. He is equally punctilious in meeting the exact requirements of his customers. All his efforts are bent upon making his business an asset to the community. Moreover, he is for ever seeking a square deal with his own people.

The pivotal factor of price, however, is determined by external forces. He may influence it to some extent by means of the special advantages of quality and service he has to offer, but in the main it is fixed by circumstances almost exclusively beyond his immediate control. Especially is this the case in such times of trade depression as that through which we are now passing. He fixes, nevertheless, a price for his goods which will enable him to discharge his debts, cover his expenses, pay a living wage to his workpeople, and give security to himself and his family. The price may be—in many instances to-day will be—too high. The market is against him. What then are the alternatives open to him? He can seek a remedy in either of two directions—by expanding or by restricting the trade he is doing. He can aim at a larger turnover at a lower rate of profit or at a smaller turnover at a higher rate of profit, relying, in the latter case, upon the quality of his wares and the goodwill of his customers to make good this curtailment of his trade. Now what do these alternatives involve? Both, as I see them, raise acute moral problems. Restriction of trade, in most cases, will

mean depletion of staff, curtailment of income, and—if pushed too far—even the Bankruptcy Court. The personal problems involved in any of these circumstances are very real indeed. Should he, for instance, or should he not make a personal sacrifice in order that every man and woman he employs may have an equitable share of whatever the business may earn? If the maintenance of his family is his first Christian duty, at what level is it right for him to fix that maintenance having regard to the necessities of others? If compelled to reduce his staff, what exactly is his responsibility towards those whom he discharges?

The alternative course is invested with similar difficulties. Under circumstances of severely curtailed demand such as obtain to-day there is a fairly definite limit to the total amount of trade that can be done. One man's gain therefore inevitably tends to mean a corresponding reduction in the actual and potential benefit available for competitors. I am leaving out of account such increases of trade as may accrue from fresh economies in production—economies which enable more to be produced at the same or less cost and which involve no economic hurt to anyone; these can safely be ignored in this argument for the reason that they are not sufficient in the aggregate to affect the final issue. In any fairly well defined class of trade, such as the grocery or clothing trades, for instance, there is at any given moment a more or less recognizable limit to the amount of business that can be done. Traders speak of getting their "share of the trade." I do not know whether many define in their minds what that share should be: as a rule I imagine it is what they can get. And a scrutiny of the bankruptcy lists in any of the trade papers is evidence that not a few fail to secure the minimum required to guarantee their solvency.

Where then comes the personal responsibility in this matter? May I reply by one or two concrete illustrations. One relates to buying, the other to selling—both to the ruthless tyranny of price. A business man receives a call from the representative of a manufacturing firm. He is offered materials at prices considerably lower than those prevailing in the trade. The price has been "cut" to secure an opening. The representative is quite candid: he admits that his firm is an exporting house that, with the breakdown of foreign markets, has felt compelled to try the home market to satisfy its needs. What is the business man to do? He knows that if he gives an order it is, so far as he is concerned, one order less for those who are legitimately depending upon the home market for their trade. On the other hand, he also knows that his competitors are not all so sensitive to the moral issues involved, that they will unhesitatingly accept the lower price, and not scruple, in turn, to gain whatever advantage they can thereby in competition with their more conscientious rivals. Before passing, we may note

that analogous to this instance is the dumping of foreign goods, produced by cheap labour, and sacrificed upon our markets to secure output and the conditions necessary for mass production. This may be merely an economic problem for the politician; it is something more for the Christian business man who has to make a personal decision; it is a very real moral one.

The business man is faced with a similar difficulty when confronted with the necessity of increasing or even of maintaining his normal turnover during times of depression. One of the features of trade during such times is the exceptionally keen price-cutting that prevails. Firms take frequent advantage of liquidated stocks thrown upon the market as the result of failures and bankruptcies. The effect of this, of course, is only to stiffen a competition already very severe. And, judging by the announcements made in the advertisement columns of the daily papers, this "slaughtering" of stock is not regarded as at all unprincipled; on the contrary, it is usually claimed as a public benefaction. People are invited to patronize the progressive firm that offers something "below the cost of production." In business circles these *coups* are regarded as smart, but quite legitimate, business. Yet the principle involved is one which would not be tolerated where the issues are more transparent—where, for instance, an attempt is made to prejudice wages in a well-organized trade by the introduction of cheap labour. A common sense of justice condemns the latter, but our moral consciousness is not so easily awakened by transactions of the former type.

The same problem arises in a different form in businesses which manufacture as well as sell. A business man is faced with the necessity of keeping his works going. There are standard expenses which must be covered if he is to avoid closing down altogether—expenses connected with the maintenance of a minimum staff, the upkeep of machinery, buildings, and so on. With the shrinkage of normal trade he is forced to seek other avenues for his output. He will possibly try in the direction of bulk trade such as is provided from time to time by Government and local authorities, large public organizations, etc. His first discovery in that event will be that he must offer at a price which can afford only a fractional profit. He may find that even then he is outbidden, that the contract has been secured by a necessitous firm which, to keep its doors open, is willing to undertake the work at, or even below, the bare cost of production. There have been many such cases during the last few years.

What does this mean to the employer who is compelled, in a lesser or greater degree, to augment his trade in this manner? It means that, with open eyes, he is contributing to an economic warfare almost as desolating in its consequences as a strife between

armed forces. If he professes Christian discipleship he cannot conscientiously refuse to recognize that this conflict too is one for the very things which Christ taught us to deny in order that we might achieve what is of far more lasting worth—peace, goodwill, generosity and self-sacrifice.

It may be urged that what I have described are the abuses of competition ; it will be pointed out that there is a form of competition which stimulates and does not degrade, which is compatible with the development and not with the warping of the spiritual life. As a theoretical assumption the statement can be accepted. But where in practice is the line to be drawn ? At what point does a man's business action become charged with moral obligation to his fellows ? A man cannot, it is true, command all the forces which contribute to the making or marring of his business ; he cannot, for similar reasons, take responsibility for every weakness of the economic system. But does this fact any the less absolve a business man from personal responsibility in giving sanction to forces and principles which, accepted, must in the final issue contribute to human misery and injustice ?

I leave the problem there. My friend asked me a question ; I cannot answer it—as yet. Possibly some of the readers of the Congregational Quarterly who are business men may contribute to a reply. I can only add in conclusion that for many business men to-day it must appear as a tragic commentary upon the economic system that makes this challenge to the consciences of Christian employers that at the present moment it is unable to provide work for nearly a million and a quarter of the people of our country, and that the provision it does make for those more fortunate in this respect is, in a vast number of instances, insufficient to secure a normal and tolerable standard of life. The problem has long ceased to be one of economics only ; it has become for every Christian man and woman engaged in business a personal problem imperilling the sincerity of their allegiance to Christ.

W. T. Carter.

PAUL AS THE INTERPRETER OF JESUS

As the course of our Lord's ministry unfolded itself, its issues came to be defined in opposition to the dominant ideas of the Pharisees, who were at that time the most advanced and influential exponents of the Jewish religion. Pharisaism represented a really remarkable achievement in formulating and organizing religious thought and practice. In its emphasis on ethics it had no rival but Stoicism, and it far outdistanced Stoicism in the warmth and depth of its piety. There was much in Pharisaism with which Jesus must have had ready sympathy. Yet it suffered from fatal perversions which made it His irreconcilable enemy. Here in the conflict between the Gospel of Jesus and the religion of the Pharisees we are on the track of the most clearly cut definition of what Jesus stood for. If therefore we could read His message through the mind of one who had come to it through Pharisaism it would seem likely that we should be brought into closest contact with its essentials. It so chances that we have this opportunity, for Paul was a Pharisee.

The breach between our Lord and the religious leaders took place through a series of conflicts which arose naturally and inevitably in the course of His active ministry. The crucial points are readily grasped by any attentive reader of the plain narrative of Mark : the forgiveness of sins, the receiving of publicans and sinners, and the authority of the legal tradition, especially touching Sabbath observance, fasting, and ritual purity. It was in no way accidental that these points in particular revealed the deep cleft between the view of life for which Jesus stood and that embodied in Pharisaism. For they all involved two very fundamental questions : the question of the character of God and His relation to sinful man, and the question of the nature and scope of the divine community.

The first issue, then, is the character of God and His relation to sinful man. The God of Pharisaism was a very great and holy God, dwelling in light unapproachable, whose very name was too holy to be pronounced. Between Him and His creatures in this lower world stood hierarchies of angels and spirits, and through them He had revealed to His own people the eternal Law upon which the universe was based. This Law was also the one basis of the moral life of man, not to be questioned, but obeyed in its minutest detail. To secure its complete authority, the piety and learning of the Rabbis had built " a fence about the Law," as the phrase went, by the erection of a tremendous system of traditional casuistry, whose sanctity was equal to that of the written Law itself. The central idea of the Law was the maxim " Measure for measure."

In dealings between men, the *lex talionis* expressed its ruling principle. Between God and men the same principle held good: he that doeth the commandments shall live: he that doeth them not is accursed. In infinite mercy God had revealed this Law to His own people. For those who knew not the Law, or knowing it disobeyed, there was no hope, save in so far as within the privileged people the merits of the Fathers, the sacrificial system, or a meritorious *t'shūbah* or penitence, offered a way by which the wrath of God might be averted and forgiveness secured.

The teaching and practice of our Lord set all this at nought. He not only questioned the sacred tradition and insisted on bringing it to the test of the original purpose of the Giver of the Law—the eternally benevolent purpose of the Father of men—but He proclaimed forgiveness and acceptance to those who stood right outside the legal system, without even waiting for them to perform a recognizable act of penitence. He defended the line He took on the ground of the character of God. The Heavenly Father, He said, is kind to the unthankful and the evil, has mercy on the undeserving, receives the returning sinner with immediate and unreserved generosity—nay more, goes out in love after the erring soul until He find it. He does not wait for men to repent, but loves them into repentance. If we would be sons of the Heavenly Father, we must love our enemies and do good to them that hate us. If we would act towards men as God acts towards us, we shall have no use for the *lex talionis*: we must forgive if we would be forgiven. All this means that forgiveness takes on a new meaning. It is a reconciliation between God and man in which the only change is on man's side, and that change is the result of the forgiving love of God already at work before repentance. That is, it is a relation between God and man which entirely transcends the legal relation. The whole mass of obstructions that hindered man from direct personal intercourse with his Father is removed: God is brought near. He reveals Himself to babes, and the only condition for entering His Kingdom is to receive it like a child.

There is here a religious revolution which could be best appreciated by one who had entered most deeply into the old legal conception of religion. Paul knew perfectly well through his own experience what Christ had done for men. The kindness of God had led him to repentance. By no merit or desert of his own, but by the sheer grace of God, he had been arrested in a course of hopeless alienation from Him, and made free to serve Him with joy and holy enthusiasm. The Law was completely transcended. "Christ is the end of the Law to everyone who has faith," and "God justifies the ungodly." We shall mistake the whole import of such statements unless we realize that they are intended to bring out the implications of what Jesus had actually done in His lifetime and what faith in Him

continued to effect after His death. He brought men into direct personal relation with God on a basis independent of the fundamental principle of legal religion—measure for measure. To come into such direct relation with God is all that is needed for forgiveness—or rather it is forgiveness: for in God there is nothing but forgiving love; it is only "the law of commandments contained in ordinances" that keeps men unforgiven, because it keeps them from God.

Paul is quite clear that this means a new conception of what righteousness means. Righteousness is not quantitative but qualitative: it is not a matter of merit calculated on the basis of fulfilment of positive precepts, but it flows out of an inward relation with God. It is the gift of God to him who has faith. It is the expression of the principle of love planted in the centre of our being through contact with God whose love is absolute: "the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts through the holy Spirit given to us," and "love is the full content of the Law." In its applications this works out just as Jesus had indicated. The evil which is in the world and embitters the life of man is only to be got rid of by the unreserved exercise of active beneficence even towards enemies: "be not overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good." A better formulation of the active principle of Christian ethics could hardly be desired, and it rests on the new idea of God given by Jesus.

It is through faith that this comes about. That word Paul took over from Jesus, or rather, while both took over the actual term from contemporary usage, the sense in which Paul employed it depends on its use by his Master. (How differently the term could be used we can see from the epistle of James and the epistle to the Hebrews.) Jesus brought men a healing of body which was intimately related to a readjustment of the life of the soul. He attributed these effects uniformly to "faith." By faith He meant such a reliance on the power of goodness in the Heavenly Father as removes every impediment to the working of that power in and for a man. "With God all things are possible," and so "all things are possible to him who has faith." Now this attitude of entire reliance on the power of goodness in God is exactly the attitude otherwise described as receiving God's Kingdom like a child. It is therefore the basis of forgiveness, which is the restoration of right relations between man and God. For such reconciliation God is ever striving, because He is absolute goodness, but it is not attained by man until, relying on the goodness of God, he opens his whole soul to the impact of that goodness. This unimpeded flow of the divine goodness into the soul worked for the paralytic both forgiveness of sins and healing of body, and we must recognize the working of what Jesus called faith not less in the restoration of the woman who was a sinner than in the cure of the centurion's boy. Faith,

then, is a self-abandonment to the goodness of God, apart from all self-assertion of any kind. That is exactly what Paul means by the faith that justifies. The man who takes his stand upon " the works of the Law " is still attempting to assert his own will, and plunging himself ever deeper into the morass of evil. He must cease asserting himself and rely upon God—and then he knows what it is to stand clear of his own sin, a free man by the power of God.

The second point on which our Lord came into collision with the Pharisees was the nature and scope of the divine community. That the purpose of God must be realized in and through a holy society was common ground. For orthodox Judaism the historic nation of Israel, or rather that remnant of Israel which kept the Law, was the chosen people. The Law and the Tradition were prized as the marks of the separateness of Israel and its divinely ordained privilege. When therefore Jesus showed Himself independent of the tradition, and even repudiated precepts of the written Law itself, He was understood to be setting Himself against the religious nationalism of which the Pharisees were the custodians. He received into His fellowship " unclean " persons and agents of the pagan Empire which to orthodox Jews was the embodiment of the power hostile to God. He recognized in a pagan soldier the " faith " which brings men near to God. He delighted to cite instances from the Old Testament of the acceptance of Gentiles—the Queen of the South, the widow of Sarepta, Naaman the Syrian, the Ninevites who repented at the preaching of Jonah. He declared that the pagan cities of Tyre and Sidon would have proved better hearers of His message than the Galilæan towns. At Jerusalem He claimed the Temple as " a house of prayer for *all nations*." When the authorities fiercely resented His action, He declared that the vineyard of God was taken away from them and given to others who would honestly yield up the fruits to its Owner, and that the Temple would be destroyed till not one stone remained upon another. The purport of all this was unmistakable. The religious authorities showed their understanding of the position by compassing the death of this traitor to the national cause. That they did so by means of a charge which implied pretensions to the political leadership of the nation was part of the fundamental irony of the situation.

The significance of what had happened was partly veiled from the first disciples. The great experiences through which they had passed knit them into a close community, waiting in tense expectation for the return of the Lord and the consummation of His Kingdom. Meanwhile they must bear their testimony to Israel, if perchance even now the belated repentance might come about and the holy nation be ready for its Messiah. They were even prepared to believe that a few individuals out of the Gentile world

might be incorporated in the Messianic community. That the glory of Israel had passed, to become the light of the world, they did not suspect. The narrative of *Acts* shows us how by degrees the Spirit of Jesus which was in them first drove some of them, in particular Peter and the friends of the martyred Stephen, into the wider world. But it remained for Paul to give permanence to the movement by supplying it with a philosophy. The people of God, he said, had been like the heir to a great estate during his minority, subject to the tutelage of a slavish Law. Now the appointed day had come and the heir received full freedom and entered upon his estate. The coming of Christ had made the difference. For the new way of faith which He had opened to men antiquated the whole system of tribal religion. With the grace of God on the one hand and faith on the other there was no place for such limitations as those which confined salvation to men within a particular national tradition. Thus the Pauline universalism is only the making explicit of the implicit and " intensive universalism " of Jesus.

But we cannot fully appreciate the meaning of this new philosophy of the divine commonwealth without taking into account the teaching of Jesus concerning the Kingdom of God. It is under the head of this inspiring but enigmatic idea that some of His most distinctive teaching falls. The idea is many-sided. It stands for that supreme good for which a man will do well to sacrifice all he has. It is a power indwelling, to be received with child-like faith and singleness of heart ; and where it is present evil is mightily overcome, health and sanity are restored and sin and sorrow flee away. It is far from being merely a mystical possession of the individual. It has an historical existence in an expanding community which grows like a mustard plant and pervades the world as leaven ferments in dough. Finally it will be consummated in unspeakable glory when the values of this life shall be sublimated into the values of the higher order and the goal of history reached in the universal sovereignty of God. So rich and many-sided is this teaching about the Kingdom of God that it has afforded and still affords endless material for controversy about the precise meaning of various passages in the teaching. It is to be doubted whether the first reporters of the sayings always understood what they reported. But it seems that we are on the right track when we see in the teaching of Jesus about the Kingdom of God a highly original construction in which personal religion is linked to history along the lines of a thorough transmutation of apocalyptic eschatology. The religion of the time, asserting that in the present age of the world God was aloof from men and left them to the guidance of the Law, asserted also that in the good time coming His presence would be revealed and everything would be transformed by that revelation. Jesus proclaimed that that good time coming was here for those

who would put forth the hand of faith and receive like a child the Father's gift. That is to say, all that an immediate experience of God's goodness and power could be expected to bring is here and now available for those who are willing to receive it. It is through such acceptance of the Kingdom that the historic consummation of God's purpose for man is to come about. The final coming of the Kingdom is not an unrelated catastrophe, but the maturing of what is even now present in early stages of growth.

In Paul's writings the actual phrase " Kingdom of God " does not fill a very important place. But the transmutation of eschatology which it represents pervades his whole thought. For the man who is in Christ the " new creation " has already come about : the new age is here : the Messianic community is functioning in the world, and through it God is bringing His purpose to pass. The long development of history has shown the hand of God in wonderful ways. He gave the promise to Abraham, He called the chosen remnant of His people, He summoned through His prophets the Gentiles into His Kingdom. And now He has brought into full life and liberty the society which is the very body of the Messiah. The powers of the age to come are abroad, and shortly the Church —reunited with its Lord—will see His growing triumph over all enemies till death itself is conquered and all things are summed up in Christ, who will then yield up the sovereignty to God. The experience of the Christian at the present moment is related to this magnificent philosophy of history. He stands at an historic crisis. The whole universe is waiting for the revelation of the sons of God. But he in Christ knows himself a son of God and in the Church he finds the family-life of God's children. There is given to him that Spirit which is the very life of God in the soul of man. Through that immediate presence of God with and in him he enjoys the " earnest " of the eternal inheritance. That is to say, here and now the Christian enjoys the authentic values of the eternal life of the Kingdom of God, though under the limitations which are inseparable from an imperfect stage in the history of the universe. The glorious consummation will not be something altogether unrelated to present experience, but its fruition.

It seems that this account of the Christian life interprets the essentials of Christ's teaching about the Kingdom of God with remarkable force and completeness. Its force is largely due to the place it assigns to Christ Himself in the process of history. Jesus was keenly conscious that He obeyed an historic calling and had an historic destiny to fulfil. He was " the Son of Man " or " the Man from heaven," whose coming into the world meant a mighty invasion of divine power for the realization of the Kingdom of God. And His coming was no mere episode. It meant that henceforth He abode as a " quickening Spirit " in the society He had created,

and by His fellowship with His own imparted to them the life of the eternal Kingdom.

Much might here be said regarding the way in which Paul's description of Christ as Son of God, living on earth the perfect human life, illuminates the self-consciousness of which the Gospels give us only passing glimpses. But there remains one question of the greatest importance. How far does Paul's doctrine of the death of Christ interpret truly its significance, both as a matter of history and as it shaped itself in the mind of Jesus? In dealing with this question we must bear in mind that the standpoint of Paul is inevitably different from that of the Gospels which are our main sources for the life and death of Jesus. The Gospels tell us of the death of Jesus as the close of His career. Paul looks upon it as the beginning of His work in the Church.

The vision of Christ crucified had brought to Paul that new knowledge of God which had made the whole world new. For in it he saw both the infinite reach of the divine love—" God commended His love to us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us "—and the supreme example of what faith involves—" He became obedient even unto death." That double revelation changed Paul's world. And he saw that the change was not merely a " subjective " one. The world itself was a different place because Jesus had died in it. Human nature itself was a different thing because Jesus had lived a perfect human life. What the Law could not do, God had done by sending His Son—He had broken the evil spell of sin and given freedom to man. All this was of the nature of observed fact in the experience of Paul himself and of others. It was a fact that Jesus had died because He confronted the sin of the men of His time with the unwearying love of God, and because He refused to narrow the grace of God to a select circle of a particular nation. It was also a fact that as a consequence of His dying a society had been created in which the grace of God worked in personal and corporate salvation beyond all bounds of nation, race, or class.

To explain these facts in relation to his whole philosophy of life and history Paul makes use of a variety of arguments and figures. Christ died as a sacrifice for sin : He died as our representative, that those who live should henceforth not live unto themselves : He bore the curse of the Law and so exhausted its power : He nailed to His Cross the bond that was against us : and so forth. These are of course attempts to rationalize, in terms of thought familiar to Paul and his readers, the facts of history and experience related to the death of Jesus. The rationalizations are the work of Paul's own mind : but the question we ask is, " How far does Paul interpret the mind of Jesus in teaching that the sacrifice of His life had positive value for the salvation of men? "

If we judge from our principal sources for the earliest history of the Church, we should conclude that the first disciples were puzzled by the death of Jesus and scarcely knew what to make of it. In the Petrine speeches of *Acts* it is little more than a fact to be apologized for—a disaster retrieved by the miracle of the resurrection. In "Q" (the tradition common to *Matthew* and *Luke* independently of *Mark*) and in the special tradition of *Luke* there is little trace of any positive doctrine of the Cross. Only in *Mark* (followed here by *Matthew*) is there any decided indication of a positive value in the death of Jesus. This indication is found in two sayings attributed to the Master Himself: "The Son of Man came to give His life a ransom for many" (10^{45}), and, "This is My blood of the Covenant, which is shed for many" (14^{24}). It is held by many critics that these sayings represent an attempt to read back into the mind of Jesus a doctrine of His death which was really the creation of Paul. In support of this conclusion is the fact that *Luke* has passages parallel to both the relevant passages of *Mark* ($22^{17-19, 25-27}$), and in neither case does his version of the saying include any reference to a redemptive meaning in the death of Jesus.[1] In fact, so far as the actual attestation of the words is concerned, it is impossible to decide definitely on their historicity. But there are certain more general considerations which may lead us a little further. First, it is difficult to give a convincing account of the motives and aims of Jesus in going to Jerusalem which shall do justice to the statements of our best sources, unless we admit that He expected from His death some positive issue of value for the Kingdom of God. Secondly, it seems that the twelve were a good deal perplexed by what was happening. At the end events moved very rapidly, and it does not appear that the disciples' thoughts kept pace with their Master's as they faced the crisis together. It is therefore altogether likely that in His mind the death He was about to die had meanings which they did not appreciate. Thirdly, there is slight but cumulative evidence in *Mark*, "Q," and the special source of *Luke*, not to speak of the inferior evidence of *Matthew*, that in facing His death Jesus was supported and inspired not only by the faith expressed in the Psalms of the suffering righteous, but also by the profound idea of the suffering Servant of God in *II Isaiah*. But according to *II Isaiah* the suffering and death of the Servant had redemptive value for the nations. If we can suppose that the mind of our Lord was moving along lines like these, we can understand better than on any other hypothesis that has been suggested, why He apparently threw away His life in that desperate venture.

[1] For in the Lukan account of the Last Supper it is most probable that the true text ends, as generally in MSS. of the "Western" group, with the words, "This is My body," the remainder being an amplification based upon Paul.

Let us put the case in this way. Our Gospels as they stand suggest that Jesus went to His death believing that by the sacrifice of His life He was accomplishing something for the Kingdom of God and the salvation of man which He had not been able to accomplish in His life. Paul assures us that in point of fact that sacrifice did inaugurate the new order in which the grace of God became available in a new way for men. Is it not most natural to conclude that Jesus truly foresaw and intended some such result as actually ensued, and that Paul is here the truest interpreter of the mind of Christ? The first disciples were perplexed by what had befallen, and they had little to report of the Lord's closing words and deeds which would indicate the positive value of His death. Paul had been through an experience which made the Cross the centre of his world, and so he was able to supplement those few meagre words which Mark had heard from Peter by an imaginative and sympathetic interpretation of what Jesus meant to do and actually did by giving Himself over into the hands of sinful men. The last days, the last earthly hours of our Lord are full of mystery. The Gospels give us in a narrative of incomparable dignity and tragic power an almost external view of the events. We are moved to the depths by the story, but we are still at a loss to know what were the springs of action, what the inward meaning of the sufferings. Much passed in the mind of the Lord, during those last days and hours, of the utmost moment, and little of it was understood by the disciples. It may be that we can come no nearer to understanding the mystery than by following the suggestion of some of the simple and profound statements which lie at the basis of Paul's intricate theological structure. "While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us", "who gave Himself for our sins that He might deliver us out of the present evil world-order according to the will of our God and Father"; and so "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself."

C. H. Dodd.

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN

SOME ASPECTS OF HIS INFLUENCE

EIGHT or ten years ago, outside an old bookshop in a Cathedral city, I was turning over the pages of Pusey's *Life*, when a member of the Chapter stopped, and seeing the book in my hand, asked what my interest was in Pusey ; and when I said that I was much more interested in Newman than in Pusey, he replied that Newman was a spent force. This seemed a very strange view to take, because to all appearances Newman is still one of the most vivid and enthralling of the Victorians. He is perhaps the most powerful of them all, because he was least of all one of themselves. In the middle years of his life when he was neglected and a stranger in his own land, he would often speak of himself as one born out of due season. It may have been so. But in the end he won his victory and became almost a knight-errant of faith. R. H. Hutton spoke of Newman's death as the extinction of a star, and said his life had been a sign to Britain.

There are some books, like *Robinson Crusoe* and *Waverley*, that we never forget reading as children ; and later on, when childhood is long past, and we are face to face with the questions which have no final answers, we never forget the first time of lighting upon the *Apologia*. The fascination of the book lies chiefly in its dramatic power in describing a spiritual and mental passion. It is the unfolding of the life of a soul. Here is Gerontius passing through his earthly purgatory. The book thrills in every page and has an insight like wizardry. At every reading the wonder grows, and a spell is cast on you as you watch this pilgrim, " with Paul's sad girdle bound," going forth from his kindred and his father's house to a land of mirage and to a people who never understood him. To anyone who thirty years ago was in the wilderness of scientific materialism the *Apologia* was an exciting vision of warm spiritual countries where voices were in the air and we were as surprised at it as the wrecked crew in *The Tempest* were at the Ariel music. The one aim of Newman's life was to make a way for the soul across the wastes which were shutting off access to the eternal ; and this aim is perfectly expressed in the words on his grave at Rednal, " Ex umbris et imaginibus in veritatem."

Reviewing all the story of the surrender he made when he entered the Roman Church in 1845, and considering the subsequent years of frustrated effort and endless conflict with the autocrats of Vaticanism, one feels that Newman never ought to have gone over, and that, magnificent as the act itself was, it was not war but a

mistake. Newman entered on his career as a Catholic without really knowing the inmost spirit of its rule. He idealized the case out of all likeness to the historical reality, and as soon as the novitiate's glamour faded and he tried to work out his ideas in the new surroundings, he discovered he was in a stuffy sectarian atmosphere among men who had little notion of English habits of thought as they existed in the main stream of national life. Only in his latest years, when the *Apologia* had given him back his great place, does he strike the old brave notes of confidence. The surrender was not really successful. There is always a backward glance to the former days and to Oriel and Oxford, and to the time when his voice made a difference. I am become a figure of history, he would say, one who once was known but now is nobody. A most touching story is that of the visit he paid to Keble and Pusey at Hursley in 1865, about a year before Keble's death. He tells in a letter how the three sat at the table—" three old men who had worked together in their prime, and after twenty years find themselves together round a table but without a common cause or free outspoken thought " ; and there is a touch of the old heart-break in the letter, the very tone of the ending of the *Apologia*, when he speaks of those who were once so united and so happy in their union in times long past. This tone of mental suffering and affectionate loyalty always sounds when he thinks of the early comradeships, and it wins the heart and softens the general opinion and gives Newman a place of his own when such a raven as Henry Edward Manning has inherited oblivion. The humanness of the Cardinal Oratorian has conquered, and Newman has a large place in our literature and in modern religion.

The two spheres of Newman's greatness cannot be separated, for whatever his place in English religion he owes much of his power to those high qualities of mind and heart which have given him a supremacy in literature. Newman says it was Dr. Hawkins, the Provost of Oriel, who first taught him to weigh his words, and that Whately taught him to think and use his reason ; but what one would very much like to know is who it was that taught him to write. Newman could strike all the chords and use nearly all the stops in the organ of language. He could use his pen as Alan Breck used his sword. There are pages in every one of his books that for pure musical English and for their light and their swiftness to a mark are the despair of the rest of men. But I am not dealing with Newman as a man of letters. All the same it must be recognized how much this superb talent contributed to his main purpose of defending Christian faith. But the very ease and clearness of his writing roused suspicions against him in those who distrusted his views. There is something else in it, they said, than simplicity—the guile of the serpent, the Jesuit's trick—it was absurd to suppose

anything could be so plain and obvious as Newman made it! The fact is that theology and science had so often gone about ragged and down at the heels that a sort of ragamuffin style had come to be thought the right thing, and certainly some of the critics could do the style very well! They called Newman's work shallow stuff and said he juggled with truth. Pure nonsense, all of it; the one fact being that Newman could write and took the trouble to do so. And in the light of Newman's work it may be worth saying that an effective Christian apologetic will always have to be written at least as well as the ordinary leaders in our best newspapers. Newman had the journalist's art; and if anyone doubts it let him read the *Tamworth Letters*, in which he took Sir Robert Peel and the great Lord Brougham to pieces. Perhaps just one illustration of Newman's writing may be given, and it shall not be the dramatic closing passage of the *Development of Christian Doctrine*, nor the famous dirge in the sermon on *The Second Spring* about the loss of Winchester and Durham, but it shall be from one of the University Sermons, the passage where he speaks of musical sounds, and after asking whether the creations some great master makes out of them are a mere ingenuity or trick of art, he says:

> Can it be that those mysterious stirrings of heart, and keen emotions, and strange yearnings after we know not what, and awful impressions from we know not whence, should be wrought in us by what is unsubstantial, and comes and goes, and begins and ends in itself? It is not so; it cannot be. No; they have escaped from some higher sphere; they are the outpourings of eternal harmony in the medium of created sound; they are echoes from our Home; they are the voice of Angels, or the Magnificat of saints, or the living laws of Divine Governance, or the Divine Attributes; something are they besides themselves, which we cannot compass, which we cannot utter—though mortal man, and he perhaps not otherwise distinguished above his fellows, has the gift of eliciting them.

But the chief source of Newman's influence was in himself, in a nature wonderfully gifted and as sensitive to moral and spiritual values as flowers are to the sun. His final success against prejudice and misconstruction was the triumph of character and of his genuine goodness. All that is essential in his life story he has told once himself and no one can ever tell it again. His own narrative of the first forty-five years enthralled the country and will never be forgotten. Set as its scenes were in the mediæval glamour of Oxford, the story reads like some spiritual phantasy of the Middle Ages, and one watches old and forgotten foes in the guise of ancient heresies attacking and attacked in conflicts which seemed too remote and fanciful to have any interest for these days. Who would ever have thought that the Monophysites could be largely responsible for one of the most dramatic changes of mind of recent times? Dean Church has gone over the whole story in his *Oxford Movement*, and as a sidelight there is Isaac Williams's *Autobiography*.

It was on July 14, 1833, that Keble preached the Assize Sermon on "National Apostasy" in the University pulpit, and Newman says he "ever considered and kept the day as the start of the religious movement of 1833." Newman was just back from his Mediterranean voyage, during which he had written at sea the well-known lines "Lead, Kindly Light." He was Vicar of St. Mary's and a Fellow of Oriel, and he was already exerting by his sermons and by his personal sway a power which seemed almost an enchantment. Men used to go about the quadrangles and streets of Oxford under a sort of spell, and would sometimes say that their creed was "Credo in Newmanum." Those were difficult times for religion; a spirit of revolution was abroad, and there was a threatening antagonism to the Church and to Christian faith. Newman and his friends feared disaster unless the Church roused itself and struck at such wild questionings with all its strength and authority. But the Church did not even know its own position and case and did not believe in itself. It was in his own search into the history and doctrines of the past and in his attempt to define the Catholic and Apostolic nature of the English Church that Newman made the discovery which for a time completely unnerved him—that if there was such a Church as he was looking for it was not the English Church at all, but the Roman Church, and that so long as he stayed where he was his lot was with the heretics. He tells how the words, "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum*," applied to the Roman hierarchy, rang in his ears and were the death-knell of his Anglicanism. To us it seems fantastical that this should be material for a catastrophe, but so it was; and when the crash came and it was said that Newman had gone, consternation spread everywhere and men were silent for a time, as when they hear that a great ship has grounded at midnight and split in twain. On that October day in 1845, when Father Dominic came to Littlemore on his way to Belgium and Newman made his submission, a spiritual tempest burst over England; and it is in trying to gauge the force of that storm which swept away so much in its wake that we can form some idea of the proportions and influence of the man whose action stirred such violent feelings:

> Was this the face that launched a thousand ships,
> And burnt the topless towers of Ilium?

Although Newman's conversion to Rome destroyed the Oxford Movement, the consequences of the movement and the power of its greatest mind created a new situation of which we cannot yet see the end. One result was the Catholic revival. Probably when all the counts are taken, it will be found that this revival as a specifically Roman revival has been over-estimated. Its prominent converts have been advertised and a considerable policy of bluff has been

pursued ; but it is very doubtful if the Roman campaign in Britain has ever recovered from the damage done by the Vatican decree of Papal Infallibility in 1870 and Cardinal Manning's part in securing it. A few men have vain dreams in their heads about the conversion of England, and a few restless minds may accept the hospitality of the Archbishop of Malines and smoke ceremonious cigars with him, but the position between Canterbury and Rome is irreconcilable. The days of riotous and malignant controversy are, one hopes, done with, and especially the vile form of argument that deals in slander and glorifies renegade priests and escaped nuns. But there is a deep and permanent controversy with Rome so long as she makes the claims she does, and any serious thought of yielding to what the Romans boast of as " the conquest of England " would smash the Church of England pell-mell into ruins in forty-eight hours.

But the Anglo-Catholic movement is a very different thing : different, that is to say, in that it claims for the Anglican Church and tries to make good in practical working exactly the position which as a legend of history, or as a bare logical theory, collapsed in Newman's hands. Men like Pusey and Church lacked Newman's genius, but they lacked his restlessness and they had a truer sense of historical values, and in their hands and those of the best of their successors a movement has grown up which in its more restrained form has given a new and vigorous life to the English Church. It may seem as though strict logic should carry the Anglo-Catholic over to Rome ; but Rome is not the English goal, and it is not the Anglo-Catholic goal. The exact situation in the Anglican Church can be best described in Dean Church's words when in speaking of the choice of those who remained behind and of what happened afterwards he says :

> It was the resolute and serious appeal from brilliant logic, and keen, sarcasm, and pathetic and impressive eloquence to reality and experience as well as to history . . . and along with this, an attempt to put in a fair and just light the comparative excellences and defects of other parts of Christendom, excellences to be ungrudgingly admitted.

These other parts of Christendom include our own Free Churches, whose excellences have been until quite recently so grudgingly admitted that we have been ranked as children of Hagar. Newman probably thought of us as men who had lost even the last rays of light that glimmered in the Anglican gloom, though he does somewhere say there is a sort of idea behind our position. Newman was greatly touched by the kindly spirit many Nonconformists showed to him,[1] and he never forgot R. H. Hutton's defence of him in the

[1] See the references to Newman in Dr. Barbour's *Life of Alexander Whyte*, and also in Dr. Mackintosh's article below, p. 196.—Ed.

Spectator at the time of Kingsley's attack. Some time in 1885 Dr. Fairbairn severely criticized Newman's *Grammar of Assent*, and said it amounted to philosophical scepticism, and Newman replied to him in an article in the *Contemporary Review* ; but he said afterwards in a letter to Lord Blatchford that he thought Fairbairn's article was " puzzle-headed," and that is very likely what he thought good-humouredly and with a certain sadness of mind about us all. His own complete revulsion from the Evangelical schools in which he was born made him feel that our position was mere shifting sand. And yet Nonconformity had a spirit in it much nearer Newman's aims than he understood. It sympathized for one thing with his assertion of the Church's spiritual independence. But the Oxford Movement affected the Free Churches in many ways ; partly by altering the types of worship, but still more by awakening a new feeling for the spiritual ideals of the Christian Church, and for a churchmanship based on the ruling presence of Christ in the commonalty of Christian believers. Another result was a more definitely sacramental view of religion, and especially of the Lord's Supper. These influences have greatly changed the outward aspect of Nonconformity in the last half-century. The old Dissent is rapidly disappearing, except from the novels of Miss Sheila Kaye Smith, who seems to rejoice in impossible chapel folk with their heads full of doomsday. A Free Church life has arisen which stands firm on spiritual and catholic foundations rather than on divergences from the Established Church. As an extreme result there is a drift here and there to Free Catholicism, but it is only a drift ; and it is not and never could be a movement in the mid-stream of Nonconformist life.

But what appealed most of all to Nonconformists in Newman's life was his utter self-abnegation for what he believed, that Quixotic journey into a mediæval wilderness, away from all his friends and traditions, his becoming a spiritual exile and gazing-stock, just as if he were some greater Richard Baxter or John Howe. We understood this. The Donatists and Monophysites did not trouble us much. But we were moved by this march into the desert. Did not our own fathers venture everything ? We have known the cruelty of prejudice and the wasting of persecution. We have known what it is to be driven out, and we felt the sob and heart-break of that last sermon at Littlemore. And when at last the changed temper of the country made what amends it could, and the Roman Church, when it might have been too late, made Newman one of her princes, there was little lacking of the deeper elements of romance. The general goodwill in which Newman died was not approval of his Romanism but of his brave unreckoning genius. And this was the feeling of those Nonconformists who had any real knowledge of him. They might sing " Lead, Kindly Light,"

and read the *Apologia* twenty times and enjoy the wit and irony of the *Present Position of Catholics*, but they had no intention of going after him, and they voted solidly at their meetings against the Pope and all his claims.

But there is another aspect of Newman's work which entitles him to rank as one of the great Christian apologists. This is a broader interest than the purely Roman interest, and is the real aim with which his life began. It must be said that Newman never was a very satisfactory Romanist, and, if his writings were never seriously in danger of the Index, he was continually under suspicion at Rome. The reason is that he took into the Roman camp his English liberty of thought and a John Bull distaste for dogmatism upon things where inquiry and discussion are necessary. These habits of English culture were provocative to men schooled in obedience, and it seemed to the small Catholic community of England as if this restless convert would turn their neat little universe upside down. He very nearly did.

Newman's mind was modern and analytical and had many of the qualities of the trained scientist. It was also the mind of a poet and visionary. He bent all his varied powers to the defence of Christian revelation, and this was the really absorbing interest of his life. Watching quietly all that was going on, he had a prophet's instinct for the controversies of the future, and he was one of the first to strike along some of the most modern lines of Christian apologetic. He believed in reasoning things out, though his treatment of the reason is rather abrupt and contradictory, and he is afraid lest men should tumble over the precipices of error if they go too far under this guide. What struck him was the narrowness of a universe defined by pure reason, and he was always saying that the real world is so much farther back than where we stand, and that our hope is in the coming of God to us and in the response of faith. He is never the pure logician, but rests in some further skill of the soul, which he curiously called "the illative sense": almost as if he combined the magic art of Prospero with the reasoning faculty of Butler.

This combination of opposite gifts and of apparently discontinuous methods makes him interesting even if he is dangerous. There is a passage in which Newman makes scorn of safe men. At any rate he himself is for seeing the open and following the hue and cry. He goes everywhere and knows about everything. A book like the *Idea of a University* is an emporium of knowledge—science, art, letters, medicine, theology—and is crammed full of acute discussions. Whatever be the exact value of the *Grammar of Assent*, it is a marvellously good account of how most of us reach our conclusions and is full of illustrations of every kind. It may not be an answer to Locke, but it is the work of a very live mind

moving rapidly and easily and never ashamed or afraid of the Christian conclusions. He never pretends the case is stronger than it is, and he will go a long way with Butler in admitting that pure reason makes probability the guide of life, and that on the grounds of reason alone we might be wrong, we might be right. Certainty and full assurance come out of another court in which there are ministries as it were of angels and the mind apprehends final truth. Newman's generous spirit towards all learning made him seem too venturesome to those who habitually fear the challenges of thought, but those who were being carried into the newer currents of research found a steadying influence in such pages as these, so full of colour and of intimate truthfulness.

This line of thought may leave the alternative of scepticism, much as Butler's method in the *Analogy* does. But when we come to the crucial test of Christian certainty we are driven to the experience of the Christian heart—to our own experience and to the cumulative tradition and witness of the Christian centuries. Truth verifies itself in the long run. It can endure all weathers—"*securus judicat orbis terrarum.*" This is what Newman would say. See how long Christianity has been in the world; in what conflicts and through what disasters it has survived; see the manner of men who have thrown away all they had for it; and see how it knows a second spring after the stormiest winter. The argument may run in several ways, but it is always at last the argument of Christian experience; the moving spectacle of life, the story told by ten thousand thousand voices of what they have handled and felt of the Word of Life. In its basis the argument is scientific, and it challenges materialism with the wider fields of the unseen. Newman was one of the first to treat of a doctrine of development, and he was also one of the first to deal with Christian experience in a modern way and by the methods of science. Always at last he looks within his own heart and within the heart of the Church, and perhaps the words of Gerontius express best of all what he felt and believed:

> So much I know, not knowing how I know:
> . . . . . some one has me fast
> Within His ample grasp . . . . . .
> . . . . . and tells me I am not
> Self-moving, but borne forward on my way.

How far this is a sound apologetic method is too big a question for discussion now; but of its helpfulness and of its adaptability to the modern position there is no question. You can hardly turn the pages of a modern religious work and not find some quotation or some example taken from John Henry Newman; there is scarcely a road in the great country of religious belief where he has not

tramped on before us. It is an apologetic which looks things straight in the face and veils nothing. Speaking of the "Apostolical Christian," he says that people do not wish to hear about him and dismiss him with the remark, "Times are changed." "Times are changed, I grant," he says, "but do persuade yourselves, I entreat you, to contemplate the picture. Do not shut your eyes; do not revolt from it; do not fret under it, but look at it. Bear to look at the Christianity of the Bible." This is what they call heading the ship to the waves and going straight at the wind. It is the dash for reality, and it is where he always begins. "I confess," he says in the *Grammar of Assent*, "to much suspicion of legal proceedings and legal arguments when used in questions whether of history or of philosophy. . . . I do not want to be converted by a smart syllogism: if I am asked to convert others by it, I say plainly I do not care to overcome their reason without touching their hearts. I wish to deal not with controversialists but with inquirers." In the same book he describes his astonishment on first finding that the natural world does not contain clearer evidences of God's presence—it is almost as if He were absent; and Newman accounts for this by man's disobedience and sin, and then goes on to say that the large and deep foundation of religion "is the sense of sin and guilt, and without this sense there is for man, as he is, no genuine religion. Otherwise it is counterfeit and hollow; and that is the reason why the so-called religion of civilization and philosophy is so great a mockery." Such was Newman's attitude to the primary questions; but at the same time he understood the necessity of following the arduous paths of knowledge and inquiry. In a lecture on "Christianity and Scientific Investigation" he spoke out plainly for liberty of research, and, referring to teachers and Professors in the University, he said: "I am not pleading that they should at random shower down upon their hearers ingenuities and novelties . . . but I say that a scientific speculator is not bound in conducting his researches to be every moment adjusting his course by the maxims of the schools or by popular traditions . . . being confident, from the impulse of a generous faith, that however his line of investigation may swerve now and then, and vary to and fro in its course, or threaten momentary collision or embarrassment with any other department of knowledge, theological or not, yet, if he lets it alone, it will be sure to come home." Practised debaters looking over such pages will see easy victories, but let them not be too sure; for just as it was said that Napoleon did not fight by the rules of the text-book and ought not to have won, so it often is in these matters of Christian defence when Newman deploys his forces. Most ministers have reams and reams of unimpeachable apologetics on their shelves, so dry as to be good only for the garden bonfire. There was a picture of Oxford

in Newman's room at the Oratory, and he had written underneath it, "Son of man, can these bones live? O Lord God, Thou knowest." Newman's bitterest opponent could never say he was dry or uninteresting; one thing he certainly did for Christian apologetics, he made the very driest bones live again.

No aspect of Newman's influence is more important than his work as a preacher. In the range of his influence he was perhaps the greatest English preacher of the nineteenth century. The pulpit was his throne, and in his most brilliant days St. Mary's was a master force in English religious life. The best period of Newman's preaching is his Anglican period; and the eight volumes of *Plain and Parochial Sermons* preached when he was Vicar of St. Mary's are books no one will ever be without who wants to know what great preaching really is. The titles of many of these sermons have become famous; for instance: "The World's Benefactors," "Unreal Words," "Remembrance of Past Mercies," "The Ventures of Faith." They were not doctrinal sermons, but exactly what he called them, *plain*; and they struck first to the roots of conscience and quietly shamed men into sincerity and reality, and changed the courses of lives. They are a key to most of what happened in Newman's life, and on them as on a deep foundation his influence rests. He once said in a lecture on preaching that definiteness is the life of preaching, and that nothing that is anonymous or that is dead and gone will preach. This is the real secret of his St. Mary's sermons. There is a story told by Scott Holland, in Wilfrid Ward's *Life of Newman*, of a conversation he had with Newman in 1877, when all the talk was about Oxford; and Scott Holland told how Pusey had been preaching a sermon to the University in a voice choked by hurricanes of coughing. "Ah yes," said Newman, "he never could manage the voice. The first time I asked him to read the lessons at St. Mary's, he spoke out of his boots; and coming out I said to him, 'Pusey, Pusey, this will never do.'" Newman understood the craftsmanship of preaching from stem to stern; but his sermons are not oratory, and only seldom are they eloquence. Their power is built up on the great commonplaces and on the simplest use of Scripture. The sermon on "Remembrance of Past Mercies" is a good example, where he enforces the homely lessons of gratitude and trust, ending in the tenderest of appeals in the undertones of faith: "He has not made us for nought; He has brought us thus far in order to bring us farther, in order to bring us on to the end. . . . What is it to us how our future path lies if it be but His path?" And the sermon finishes in an array of pure splendour solely in the words of Scripture, and in the assurance that "the flame shall never kindle upon us." It makes one long for a return to simplicity and to have done with rhetorical flourishes and the banalities of cheap success.

It is more than thirty years since Newman died, and it is nearly eighty years since that event which was like a thunder-flash over England. There is hardly another recent life over which controversy has raged so hotly, and it is too soon yet to say what the final verdicts on some points will be. But one point the *Apologia* for ever sets at rest, and that is Newman's sincerity and integrity. "I do not like to be called a liar to my face," he said to Kingsley; and no man ever struck harder in self-defence than he struck then, nor ever struck blows more shattering and successful. His life was from beginning to end chivalrous, and for all time, in good report and in evil, he had taken the cross of Christ for his guerdon. The ideals and aims of his life are set forth in the words he once spoke to his brethren of the Oratory:

I would beg for you this privilege, that the public world might never know you for praise or for blame, that you should do a good deal of hard work in your generation, and prosecute many useful labours, and effect a number of religious purposes, and send many souls to heaven, and take men by surprise, how much you were really doing, when they happened to come near enough to see it; but that by the world you should be overlooked, that you should not be known out of your place, that you should work for God alone with a pure heart and single eye, without the distractions of human applause, and should make Him your sole hope, and His eternal heaven your sole aim, and have your reward, not partly here, but fully and entirely hereafter.

A. T. S. James.

WONDER, WISDOM AND WORSHIP

The haunts of wisdom are the silent places
Where holy habitations have been made.
As to the country-born there come at times,
Amid the unleisured happenings of the town,
Scent of deep meadows and the call of birds,
So unto us with strange disturbance comes
Wonder. Amid the unreturning hours
That lavishly we pour like spikenard
Over great mammon's feet of clay, we pause,
And something finer in us reaches out
For wisdom.

Along the immemorial mind of man
Wonder has worn in savage and in seer
The grooves that lead to worship and to God.
From Him ascend as from a central fire
Thoughts glowing with imperishable hope.

A. Landon.

THE GENIUS OF CONGREGATIONALISM

I

One of the features of our time is that denominationalism is meaning far less than it used to mean, that the walls between our various folds are being made lower, that the spirit of unity and understanding between the Churches is growing, and that the sects are behaving rather more as Christians. "Christianity," says Dean Swift, "which ought to make men *love* one another, seems in weak doses to make men *hate* one another"—and ecclesiastical history provides sad illustration of the saying. Happily that stage of bigotry and uncharitableness is passing. We cannot speak of any denomination as holding the monopoly of truth and grace: we can only speak of each as making some special contribution to the Holy Catholic Church, as bearing some special witness, laying some special emphasis, of which the Church in general stands in need.

What then are those elements for which we stand in our particular section of Christendom? What can be our characteristic contribution to the Holy Catholic Church? What is that which explains our origin and history, and constitutes our real ideal in the religious life of our age? One takes it to be a more or less conscious *quest for Reality in Faith and Life*, a "return to Nature" in the realm of the soul. *A passion for Reality—a return to Nature*—these are the distinctive elements for which we stand.

In *Heroes and Hero-Worship* Thomas Carlyle speaks of the war of the Puritans under Cromwell as "a section of that great universal war which alone makes up the history of the world—the War of Belief against Unbelief—the struggle of men intent on the *real essence of things* against men intent on the *semblances and forms of things*." We have here our genius and idealism in a couple of sentences. Free Churchism at its best is "intent on the real essence of things." Our ideal is to stand for the quest for reality, for zeal for reality—primarily for reality in religion, and then, because religion cannot be divorced from life, for reality in life, honesty in thinking, simplicity and integrity in conduct, personal and political. In Faith, and in all things affected by Faith, our ideal is fidelity to what rings true.

We must confess that we in the Free Churches are not always true to our genius: sometimes there is among us a deplorable amount of formalism, artificialism, make-believe, hypocrisy, and a great deal of divorce from living faith and from the realities of life and thought. Our denominational bodies have sometimes lived

longer than our denominational souls. On the other hand, we have, happily, no monopoly of this quest for reality. In recent years we have been able to witness " Life and Liberty " movements in Anglicanism ; the Bishops, at Lambeth and subsequently, have shown a readiness to reconsider old positions, and the growing Modernist movement is essentially a quest for intellectual reality. Still, if we must generalize, it may be said that the distinctive genius of Free Churchism as a whole lies in an earnestness for *reality* against *formalism*, for *spirit* against mere *letter*, for *experience* against mere *tradition*, for *prophetism* against *priestism*.

II

This zeal for Reality explains our historical origins. It is our spirit of a return to Nature in religion which really links us with the New Testament Church. It is the principle of our " apostolic succession." We used to try to establish our principle of continuity with that New Testament Church on the lines of organization and details of belief. We used to be anxious to prove that the Earliest Church was Independent in its constitution. We wanted Scriptural sanction even for our organization. But why should we worry about our twentieth-century forms of government being the same as those of a young and semi-developed Church, working under conditions in some ways peculiar to itself ? The only question which ought to concern us is which form of organization is most efficient and satisfactory for the conditions of our own day. It may be connexional, independent, or episcopal ; it may be with moderators, or without them—these are questions to be answered by the tests of spiritual efficiency to-day, not by conformity with the New Testament pattern. Why should we think that societies like the New Testament Church should be launched into the world with a ready-made, permanent and universal constitution ?

Nor do we even find our continuity with the New Testament Church by mere theological identification. Christianity is a life rather than a creed, a spirit rather than something to be carved on tables of stone. Theology developed even in New Testament times, and it was all theology with Christ as the centre, but several stages of theological belief are to be plainly seen in the pages of the New Testament itself. We could not, however hard we tried, enter into every detail of belief held by New Testament writers. They were, in many respects, children of their own day, and the treasures of Christ were often held in earthen vessels. We must leave it to the mechanical, priestly Churches to be theological museum keepers —we have a more virile and spiritual function. " They must ever up and onward, who would keep abreast of Truth."

But that which does give us a true link of continuity with the

New Testament Church is a common quest for reality, a return to nature, the common " struggle of men intent on the real essence of things, against men intent on the semblances and forms of things." For our Lord's ministry was essentially a return to nature—a return from the formalism and legalism of contemporary Jewish faith to the humanism of religion. His work was, as Matthew Arnold put it, to " open out afresh the choked-up wells of human religious intuitions." It seemed to men that our Lord was destroying law and prophets—His answer was that He had come to " fulfil " them, to release the old truth that had been frozen and stereotyped into untruth, to break the ancient alabaster box of spikenard, very precious, that the house of His own generation might be filled with the odour of the ointment.

The work of St. Paul was that of a spiritual radical. What was really at the bottom of things ? What really mattered in religion ? " Neither circumcision nor uncircumcision, but a new creature " ; " The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life " ; " Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." There was a challenging and testing of tradition, and out of it all came a *New* Testament, a spiritual freshness and reality. The atmosphere of Judaism had become stuffy : these New Testament men broke the ecclesiastical windows, and the fresh, vitalizing breezes of the spirit blew into the temple of Faith.

As time went on the inevitable happened. Hardening, stereotyping tendencies manifested themselves in the Christian Church itself. Men ceased to think for themselves. As someone neatly says : " Saint John and Saint Paul *thought*—those that followed them *quoted*." Still, for the first three centuries—the period during which Christianity made its amazing conquest of the Roman Empire —there was comparatively little stress on definition and uniformity. Afterwards, for mixed good and evil, the Roman love of government, order, discipline, set religion under a drill-master. The ideal was conceived of one united uniform Church which would act, speak, and even think and feel as one. It must be a perfectly disciplined army. There was no respect for individual personality.

Two or three consequences inevitably followed. The Church created that period of mental stagnation which we call the Dark Ages. It set the Inquisition on men who dared to think. Reason was dismissed as superfluous and dangerous. Then moral life degenerated. Mechanical thinking was followed by no thinking at all, mechanical morality by no morality at all. A world out of touch with reality soon became morally dissolute ; the semblances and forms, being no longer maintained by the essence of reality, were corrupted into superstitions ; faith and worship became things of dead form and make-believe.

And then came a breath of life, the Spirit of God, over Europe, and the valley of dry bones began to live again. In every depart-

ment of life the Renaissance was felt. There was a return from tradition to reality. Men sought first-hand knowledge again. For instance, the students of anatomy no longer turned to the ancient text-books—they went to study directly from the human frame. That was significant of the whole movement. The influence of that return to nature affected religion. The Reformers, with all their limitations, were feeling back after a lost reality in religion. They went back to the experiences of their souls and consciences and set out to reconstruct a faith and a morality which would ring true. They sought " the real essence of things against men intent on the semblances and forms of things."

In that spirit the earlier Free Churches were born. Presbyterianism, Independency, Quakerism—these represent waves and degrees of Reformation, protests against the system which mechanized and formalized religion. Nor can we exclude from our category a large Puritan element which has always existed within the Anglican Church—our ecclesiastical severance from whom has been a most unnatural and unhappy division. Later there came another " return to nature " in the Evangelical Revival of the eighteenth century. The significance of the Wesleyan movement was that of a return to the realities of the religious situation—" Church or no Church, the people must be saved." If ecclesiastical machinery would not allow the primary work of the gospel to be done, if ecclesiastical tradition would not cover the cases of the Kingswood colliers—so much the worse for ecclesiastical machinery and ecclesiastical tradition !

> Even as they list, the winds of the Spirit move,
> To turn or *break* our century-rusted vanes.

We may regret the fissiparous tendency of Nonconformity—especially perhaps since that evangelical revival—the creation of new sects and the multiplication of more or less rival Bethels in every village—but, at any rate, it betokened the restlessness of life and the driving force of religious earnestness. Now we are seeking to correct the vicious excesses of a virtue, but God forbid that we lose the virtue itself. We are learning the religious duty of sympathetic co-operation—God forbid that we weaken our sense of individual faith and personal conviction. We cherish the dreams of reunion—but *a reunion that shall come not from sacrifice of reality, but from the reconciliation which reality brings*, for even as " Truth doth heal the wounds which Truth herself doth make," so that quest for reality which has divided us is the only wholesome force to bring us together again. Is not sound scholarship, which is a result of the intellectual quest for reality, one of our most powerful reconciling factors ? Is not the facing of our practical problems of evangelization at home and abroad one of the things bringing the

Churches together? Reunion will only come through a quest for reality. If we would be one, we must drive down to that which is below our differences—the Truth which is one, unifying and reconciling.

III

While this quest for reality explains the origins of Dissent in general, it particularly explains our own system. Our ecclesiastical forebears had the consciousness that large organization might tend to cramp the individual freedom of the spirit and the "liberty of prophesying." And so jealous of such spiritual liberty were they that they reduced organization to a bare minimum. They would in their Church relations be independent of the State, independent of a central Presbyterian synod, independent of a bishop, independent even of the other Churches of their own order; they would not have their quest for truth and reality cramped by the authority even of a creed, for a creed might become formal—they would rather trust the spirit of Christ within the Church to lead them into all the truth. But mark this! Not only did Reality make them repudiate the authority of other Churches—*it supplied them with a new authority in itself*, and because of that, with all this freedom, the independent Churches have kept to the central things of faith, and have found in Jesus of Nazareth the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

Let us realize and emphasize the underlying idea of all this—*the quest for religious reality*, which in certain historical circumstances these devices of Church government were meant to serve. We stand for something far bigger and nobler than the independence of the individual Church, or the paring down of organization to a bare minimum. We can exalt the method into a fetish, and miss the spirit which the method was intended to serve. We can be true to the principles of spiritual freedom and individual conviction, "liberty of prophesying" and fidelity to reality and experience, and still go far with an organization giving mutual help and general efficiency. We can, on the other hand, be most correctly "Independent," and manifest a local tyranny and intolerance which is heresy against the central principle of our witness. We need to recognize clearly what we stand for, if only to realize that there are certain other things historically associated with our system for which we do *not* essentially stand, with which we do not need to maintain an eternal identification.

For instance, we need to deliver ourselves from the fetish idea that every Church, however small, should have its own minister. We can never hope to attain the efficiency of a connexional body like the Wesleyans or Primitive Methodists unless—in country districts especially—we cordially recognize the principle of "grouping." This matter is not one that merely concerns weak

Churches; there is a senseless waste of effort offered in sacrifice to this fetish in our stronger town Churches. At present each has its own minister, who, week after week, morning and evening every Sunday, must preach to his own congregation. Why should he? How can he keep his preaching fresh? Why should there not be such a systematic exchange of pulpits among two or three Churches, so that while the minister should be once every Sunday at his own church, he would for the other service be giving his message, giving the outcome of his own particular reading, presenting his own outlook and observation of life, to some other of this group of local Churches? Congregationalism will not be able to maintain its proper contributions to scholarship, will not be able to allow its men opportunities to specialize in social problems, Sunday-school preparation, the facing of the deeper problems of thought, as long as it insists on a homiletic grind for its ministers of two or three sermons a week. Moreover, if instead of four isolated Churches, each with its own isolated minister we had a district group Church with its staff of four ministers serving the combined district Church, how much closer and more Christian would be our Church life, how much more interest we could take in each other's work. We should get to know one another better and feel a closer sense of comradeship, while the period during which a Church is without a minister would lose many of its grave perils, for the Church would feel that the other ministers of the common staff were partly its own. Another incidental advantage would be that, with less exacting pulpit demands, ministers would be more likely to prolong their ministry within the particular Church and preserve those pastoral relations which can constitute the most valuable part of their work. Men become "preached out" far too soon because of our lack of intelligent co-operation in preaching. We want to make experiments in "group-churchmanship," and realize that such group-churchmanship does not clash in the slightest with the spiritual principles of Congregationalism.

Once again, Puritanism in its hatred of forms and formalism often failed to appreciate the value of *true forms*—true symbols of reality. It may be that we are losing a great many of our people to Anglicanism because we have not given sufficient care to beauty, order, taste and symbol in our services. *It is a sad caricature of the love of reality when men make a virtue of bareness, slovenliness and ugliness in Church worship.* There is a real and subtle connexion between æstheticism and the mysticism of worship. The latest psychology, emphasizing the value of suggestion in appealing to the sub-conscious tracts of our personality, surely hints at its value in our Churches and services. The High Churchmen use it—why should not we for higher ends? That which may be used may also be abused, but that is true of every force and power in life. Our

business is not to abolish, but to find the laws of healthy use. If evil there be in symbol, it is not in the use in religion of methods found highly valuable in educational work, but *in the symbolizing of a wrong idea, or in the confusion of symbolic act with the very alien idea of magic.* Carlyle, after saying that the Puritans were intent on the real essence of things against men intent on the forms and semblances of things, adds : " It were more just to call them haters of untrue forms." " The naked formlessness of Puritanism," he continues, " is not the thing I praise in the Puritans : it is the thing I pity—praising only the spirit which had rendered that inevitable." Sometimes one has dreams of a new Congregationalism in which prophetic realism will be wedded to beauty and reverence of worship, where the best in Anglicanism and the best in Puritanism will meet, where reality shall be expressed, not only in the symbolism of words, but in the symbolism of action, art and music. We have given much attention to the art of preaching in our Nonconformist circles. We shall do well to give equal reverent study to the sacred art of worship, and still be true to our denominational witness to reality, as long as we take care that the symbol symbolizes the real and that we recognize its nature as a symbol.

Once again, Puritanism *in its zeal for the real, often fell short of its quest and only found the commonplace.* In weeding out the tares of the unnatural, it often uprooted the wheat of the supernatural. In making God familiar, it sometimes made Him cheap. Do not the Free Churches stand in need of a kind of Oxford Movement, which shall exalt the reality of the supernatural in the Church, which shall preserve the sense of reverence and wonder, which shall make the ministry mean more, both to minister and people, which shall cultivate the sense of the Real Presence and show God, not only " closer than breathing and nearer than hands and feet," but high and lifted up upon the throne of His glory, with his train filling the Temple, and with cherubim and seraphim continually crying " Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty " ? It is as necessary to *dread* God as to *love* Him. Have we not largely lost our sense of holy fear ? Have we not come to look upon God too familiarly, to think and speak of Him as did the piece of pottery in Omar Khayyam—" God's a Good Fellow—and t'will all be well " ! Have we not fallen into cheap views of worship, cheap views of God, cheap views of the ministry—and alas! as a consequence, cheap and shallow views of life ? We have allowed the vision splendid of our faith to "fade into the light of common day." Our quest for reality has here gone wrong. Isaiah only saw himself, his work and his fellows in their true lights, *after* he had seen his vision of the might and majesty and transcendent glory of the Lord high and lifted up, and before we discover the profoundest reality of things we must be cast down and exalted by a vision of the glory of the Most High.

IV

Lastly, if we frankly confess our faults, let us also take a proper and stimulating pride in our virtues. The Church and the world have need of us and of the spiritual element of our Independent tradition. Ours has been a faith for strong men—men respecting conscience and reason, men of stamina, daring to think freshly, daring to stand alone—and such men it continually needs. "The Independent position," says Dr. Selbie, "requires something more than ordinary human nature to work it. . . . In its ideal of the Church and Christian life there is

> Something almost too great and good
> For human nature's daily food."

Congregationalism needs religious aristocrats in the best sense; it becomes a miserable thing when worked by men of poor spirit, narrow ideas and little spirituality. Congregationalism finds it hard to live in degenerate ages; it has little or no machinery to help it through critical times, when faith waxes weak and men love shallowness and make-believe, when they distrust reason and are too lazy to think and venture. A decline in the spirit of a community will react upon Congregationalism sooner than on any other of the great denominations. Ours is not a Church for weaklings and easy-going folk; it demands qualities of earnestness, endurance and intelligence. But if this age is in many ways unfavourable to our order of Churches, we recognize on the other hand that it needs the strong spirit for which our type of Church has historically stood. There is the suggestion of a social virtue in the very name—Independency. We want in Church and society men who dare to stand alone and be true to their best, whatever be the suggestion of fashion, custom, crowds, collective sentiment. Our social temper is becoming parasitical. We are becoming too dependent on other people doing things for us. We are losing healthy self-reliance. We want other people to earn for us, save for us, work for us, think for us. Is there not need for the self-respecting, reason-respecting, God-respecting spirit of independency to correct this prevailing sentiment of weak reliance on others, this unworthy parasitism in society, in industry, in religion? Is not the spirit of the Puritans wanted to remind us all that life is not enjoying ourselves at society's expense, content with merely sharing privileges won by others' toil and agony, but rather rising up to a sense of our personal worth and dignity and taking our part in a world, the welfare of which rests upon the hearty and honest co-operation of every man and woman?

And further, is not the supreme need of the world and the Church, that of Reality? Is not the most urgent call that for men "intent on the real essences of things, against men intent on the semblances

and forms of things " ? Once more we need a return to nature. The hope of our time lies in a new sincerity and realism in faith and social sentiment. Man cannot live by fooling and make-believe, especially in his religion and social duties. Make-believe in religion —pretending to believe what we cannot believe—what more evil spirit than this to corrupt a nation ? Make-believe in society and politics—have not these invited the long series of troubles and disasters which in our generation have plagued unhappy Europe ? Our international strifes, our labour troubles—have they not largely arisen because men were insincere, and therefore men distrusted one another and could not believe in one another's word ? Our only cure is a universal healthy realism, in which quackery, flummery and conventional insincerities may have no place, but every man may see the world as it is and speak truth with his neighbour. In this salvation the Church must be the natural leader. But she can only lead if she be true to herself. " They who would fight for Thee on earth must first be true within." We must be true to our great and noble tradition of *reality*. Our forms of worship must be sincere. Our doctrines must correspond with our fullest and deepest experience. We have learnt much in the last half-century concerning the nature of the Scriptures—we must have the honesty and courage to present that. " If there be truth, above board with it ! " cried Chalmers. We must be zealous for reality in business relations, for commercial honesty. Our Church officials and Church members must be men above reproach in business. They must be zealous to remove any cause for the common gibe of the business man that one must be specially careful in dealing with a man who makes a conspicuous religious profession. Our really serious heresies should be regarded as those against the laws of love, of sincerity and of honesty ; compared with these, intellectual heresies against creed and theology are minor things.

And our passion for reality will bring us to a real Christ—and Congregationalism must ever be Christo-centric, must ever stand for Him. Men have covered that simple message of Galilee which the world needs so much to-day with so many theological elaborations and set up so many ecclesiastical substitutes that we have almost forgotten the things which He stressed and treasured. We must get back to Him, the real Jesus, the understandable Jesus, with a plain, understandable and confirmable message, and a Divine personality reinforcing it. His words are the words of eternal life—they ring true, fit into life, touch experience and supply the only rule of living which can bring healing and health to this foolish and vexed world.

This then seems to be the spirit of Independency at its best. A passion for reality, for the " real essence of things " ; respect for reason and conscience and spirituality ; stamina in faith and

life ; sincerity, honesty, broadmindedness ; and expectation that " God has yet more life and truth to break forth from His word." This is our special contribution to the religious life of the world.

Thou Church of Prophets, freedom-thrilled,
The Holy Catholic Church hath need of thee,
To fill with Pentecostal fire the Temples old,
To free the living Truth from cords which ancient Love hath twined,
With Life's warm breath to thaw the frozen creeds,
And give the Spirit, from the Letter's bondage, liberty.
Pillar of fire, that leadest on, when timorous souls
Linger around the whitened ash where Faith flamed yesterday,
The Church hath need of thee, Church of the moving Fire of God.

H. Bulcock.

CONGREGATIONALISM IN LITERATURE

All over Europe, wherever the new Protestant Churches of the princes were set up, a living and very active residuum of Protestants remained who declined to have their religion made over for them in this fashion. These were the Nonconformists, a medley of sects, having nothing in common but their resistance to authoritative religion, whether of the Pope or the State. Most, but not all, of these Nonconformists held to the Bible as a divinely inspired and authoritative guide. This was a strategic rather than an abiding position, and the modern drift of Nonconformity has been onward away from this original Bibliolatry towards a mitigated and sentimentalized recognition of the bare teachings of Jesus of Nazareth.—H. G. Wells : *The Outline of History.*

The Church of England was supposed to have a hold on the aristocracy, the Congregational Churches on the middle class, and the Methodists on the working class, but now no Church seems to have any real hold on any class. . . . There is now as little of the music of the people in our hymn-book as in the Anglican or Congregational Hymn-books.—T. Tiplady : *The Church and the Outsider.*

It is because Independency is not a Church system that I cleave to it. A company of men and women meeting for religious worship and teaching and work is not a sect. Any number of such companies meeting for brotherly counsel and co-operation is not a sect. It is the simplest form of Church organization in which the Christian life can nourish itself and act on society.—Baldwin Brown.

Certainly, to this hour, Protestantism as such has produced, within and for religion specifically, nothing that can seriously compare, in massive, balanced completeness, with the work of the short-lived golden Middle Ages of Aquinas and Dante.—Baron von Hügel.

A SPASMODIC POET

THE Oxford University Press has published an edition of Professor Aytoun's poems, in their admirable series of standard authors. *Poems of William Edmondstoune Aytoun* contains practically all his translations, his ballads and miscellaneous verse. Aytoun was a truculent Jacobite during the earlier part of last century; his *Lays of the Scottish Cavaliers* were more than sentimental variations on the ballad music popularized by Scott and Macaulay. But he was also a versatile writer of humorous poetry, and students to-day who shout *The Massacre of the Macpherson* are not always aware that they owe these rollicking stanzas to an Edinburgh professor of rhetoric and literature. Indeed, the most vital pages in this edition are those with his contributions to the *Bon Gaultier Ballads*. We are even provided with *Bothwell*, an unsuccessful attempt to whitewash the handsome, fascinating savage who led Queen Mary into her last, fatal infatuation; but Bothwell soliloquizing over his wild past is not a figure who impresses us. It is far more interesting to turn over the pages of *Firmilian*, the dramatic travesty which Aytoun published in 1854. He liked to dip into good-humoured satire of his contemporaries; even the young Tennyson did not escape his attentions. But *Firmilian* was written to deride a group of minor poets, dubbed "the spasmodic school." Aytoun disliked their exuberance and affectations. Especially he objected to their chaotic outpourings. "They rarely, if ever, attempt anything like a plot. After you have finished the perusal of their verses, you find yourself just as wise as when you began. You cannot tell what they would be at. You have a confused recollection of stars, and sunbeams, and moonbeams, as if you had been staring at an orrery; but sun, moon and stars were intended to give light to something, and what that something is, in the poet's page, you cannot, for the life of you, discover." Aytoun was referring particularly to some recent poems. *Firmilian* is not another case of "English Bards and Scots Reviewers," for one of the derided bards was Scottish. This was Alexander Smith, whose *Life Drama* indeed, in 1852, became as popular as Lewis Morris's verse did afterwards. Not even Aytoun's banter checked its vogue. My copy is dated 1856, and it is a fourth edition. But when you read it over again and then read *Firmilian*, you see how cleverly Aytoun parodied it, and how the Edinburgh ridicule had for once a patent of right. Aytoun's hero, for example, extols a poet-friend of his who adored a negress:

You have heard the strains
That Dante, Petrarch, and such puling fools
As loved the daughters of cold Japhet's race,
Have lavished idly on their icicles;
As snow meets snow, so their unhasty fall
Fell chill and barren on a pulseless heart.
But, would you know what noontide ardour is,
Or in what mood the lion, in the waste,
All fever-maddened, and intent on cubs,
At the oasis waits the lioness,
That shall you gather from the fiery song
Which that young poet framed, before he dared
Invade the vastness of his lady's lips.

Now while *A Life Drama* lies open to Aytoun's charge of formlessness, Smith's verse too often has the hectic, exaggerated sentiment which his critic is satirizing here. Surely the Scottish poet deserved what he got, when he had actually, for example, written the following lines to describe how Lady Barbara and Sir Arthur met unexpectedly in the garden:

There was a cry of joy, with seeking hands
She fled to him, like worn bird to her nest;
Like washing water on the figured sands,
His being came and went in sweet unrest,
As from the mighty shelter of his breast
The Lady Barbara her head uprears
With a wan smile, "Methinks I'm but half blest:
Now when I've found thee, after weary years,
I cannot see thee, love! so blind I am with tears."

Another book of the same kind, which Aytoun had been reading, was *The Roman*, published in 1850 by a young poet called Sydney Thompson Dobell, who followed it up in 1853 with the first part of a meandering epic called *Balder*. Smith and Dobell were close friends, but neither has had the stuff that endures in poetry. Their extravagant popularity has been followed by an almost total neglect. They rarely appear, even in special anthologies, though Dobell is represented in the second series of *The Golden Treasury* by his "Ballad of Keith of Ravelston"; this and three other short poems appear in Sir Arthur Quiller Couch's *Oxford Book of English Verse*, and the same editor's good judgment has inserted five of Dobell's poems and two sonnets in the *Oxford Book of Victorian Verse*. This is all to the good. But Dobell deserves ample notice, and as it is exactly a hundred years since his birth it is worth while to look back upon his work for a moment.

He was born in Kent in 1824 on the 5th of April, and most of his life was spent in Gloucestershire. He travelled for the sake of his health on the Continent and in Scotland, but Gloucestershire was his centre. His father was a wine-merchant at Cheltenham. Dobell was never wealthy, but he had a modest competence, which enabled

him to care for his health and for his wife's, and also to gratify his literary tastes. He seems to have been a sensitive, noble-minded gentleman. His latter years were clouded, and he died in 1874. In the following year his poems were edited by Professor John Nichol. I can still remember Nichol speaking to us warmly of his character and work. Nichol always insisted that he was a thoughtful, sensitive poet, whose verse, rich in more than faults, would prove to be permanent. "He belonged to the spasmodic school, with which he was, during his residence in Edinburgh, topographically associated, in virtue of defects shared with men indefinitely his inferiors. Of these the chief were occasional violences and frequent involutions of expression, recalling the conceits of Donne and others of the so-called metaphysical school of the seventeenth century; a tantalizing excess of metaphor, a deficient sense of artistic proportion, and a weakness, latterly outgrown, for 'fine things.'" I doubt whether Alexander Smith and Bailey were "indefinitely inferior" to Dobell, though *Festus* is a work which I shall never open again, even for the purpose of criticism. But this was the group to which Dobell belonged, the group of which Aytoun made such clever fun. "A satirical poet," said Dryden, "is the check of the laymen on bad priests." Dobell and his fellows were bad priests in the sense that their methods were often "bad," and it was in the interests of good taste that these good men were checked.

What strikes the reader in Dobell's verse at first, however, is not the spasmodic quality, but the pensiveness. He likes to write in and about a gentle melancholy, about

> Voices of eld,
> The home, the church upon the village green,
> Old thoughts that circle like the birds of even
> Round the grey spire.
>
> Through click of gates and the games
> Of the living village at play,
> Let me hear forgotten names
> Of ancient day.
> Down like a drop of rain from the evening sky
> Let somewhat be said;
> Up from the pool, like a bubble, let something reply,
> In the tongue of the dead.

He is not spasmodic in the sense that he is melodramatic; the "spasmodic" note lies in his attempt to force the music of a mood. He tries to make more out of a sentiment than it will yield fairly, and the result is a lack of concentration, which spoils some of his better work. Partly this was the result of precocity, for Dobell's main verse were written by the time that he was thirty, and he had the youth's love of fine writing for its own sake. Emotions flowed over his soul, but they were allowed to flow into words without sufficient self-

criticism. Dobell was too conscious of how a thing ought to be said in verse, and too conscious of verse requiring to say something. Certainly this was better than some methods of modern verse-writers, especially in so-called "free" verse, who are unconscious that verse should say anything at all, except perhaps what is unconventional. But there is little or no careless rapture about Dobell, even in his lyrics. Verse was for him the expression of lofty ideas and ideals which he desired to communicate to the world. He was rarely carried away by a rush of thought and feeling. When he seems to be inspired, he is generally rhetorical and didactic ; you are conscious in reading his verse that he has designs upon you, and instinctively you evade him.

Probably his poor health explains the lack of vitality and verve in his poems, as it explains his predilection for the passive, reflective aspect of life. He is pensive. But a pensive poet requires either variety or a vein of humour. And Dobell had neither. He does not stand back from his emotions and experiences now and then. Ecstasy and a sense of humour have this in common, that they detach a writer from himself, and prevent him from fingering his own pulse. But Dobell lacked these qualities, and with the change of taste and outlook his verse has failed to retain its initial popularity.

But in reading it over again, I see merits, or at any rate attractions. For one thing, Dobell throws out repeatedly fine phrases and lines. There are more crabs and stones than anemones in most of his pools, but he certainly has a command of pretty metaphors and similes, and you have not to look far for them in the larger pieces. Then, again, he lived through the Crimean War, and his experience draws him nearer to ourselves. In one of his war-sonnets he describes a young wife longing for her husband, who is serving in the Crimea :

> Upon the sill
> She fed his favourite bird. "Ah, Robin, sing!
> He loves thee." Then she touches a sweet string
> Of soft recall, and towards the eastern hill
> Smiles all her soul—for him who cannot hear
> The raven croaking at his carrion ear.

I quote this, not simply to illustrate his power of isolated imagination, but to recall a parallel. Thackeray had a few years earlier put into prose the same idea, in the famous passage at the close of the thirty-second chapter of *Vanity Fair*. "No more firing was heard at Brussels—the pursuit rolled miles away. Darkness came down on the field and city : and Amelia was praying for George, who was lying on his face, dead, with a bullet through his heart." Dobell, however, had a faith beyond the grave. One of his explicit convictions is put at the close of a sonnet to a bereaved friend :

He who being bold
For life-to-come, is false to the past sweet
Of mortal life, hath killed the world above.
For why to live again if not to meet?
And why to meet if not to meet in love?
And why in love if not in that dear love of old?

His war-poems sound the familiar notes of poetry written during a national struggle. Dobell was not a jingo, but neither was he a pacifist; the war did not silence him, nor did it make him a Pharisee, as war does to many intellectuals. Dobell's moral fibre stood the strain of the crisis. We turn over his verse, and hear the pride and pathos, the hopes and fears of the day.

Whether our bloodsheds flow or cease,
I know that as the years increase,
The flower of all is human peace.

So sentimentalists dream and hope, to-day as they did sixty years ago. Still the thought rises, which Dobell also phrased neatly:

If England's head and heart were one,
Where is that good beneath the sun
Her noble hands should leave undone?

Or again, he touches a recent chord when he expresses, in the lines on "A Hero's Grave," the parent's bitter disdain of

Echoing lands that ring with victory,
And answer for the living with the dead,
And give me marble when I ask for bread,
And give me glory when I ask for thee—
It was not glory I nursed on my knee.

In the wider stretches of his verse, when he is not brooding or apostrophizing, he reaches the reader's heart by an honest interest in the charms and calls of nature. Thus, it is easy to recognize his affection for the sea, at any rate in his verse. This comes out in the well-known song, beginning,

High over the breakers,
Low under the lee,
Sing ho
The billow,
And the lash of the rolling sea—

Or in the passionate eagerness of the cry:

The boats are lowered: I leap in first;
Pull, boys pull! or my heart will burst!
More! more!—lend me an oar!—
I'm thro' the breakers! I'm on the shore!
I see thee waiting for me, love!

Here too we note the chiming effect which Dobell liked to produce, by rhyme and reiteration. He shows a fine ear for melody

in his lyrics. But again, he did not know when to stop. His artistic skill was not enough to prevent him from writing lines like these, for example :

> Low and high, high and low,
> Now and then, then and now,
> Now, now ;
> And when the now is then, and when the then is now,
> And when the low is high, and when the high is low,
> Low, low ;
> Let me float, let the boat
> Go, go.

Whereupon the reader groans, " And let *me* go ! "

Another quality is his pre-Raphaelite love of detail, as in the lines on an orphan child lying awake at night in the nursery :

> And no more the music sweet
> Up the house doth pass,
> Nor the dancing feet
> Shake the nursery glass ;
>
> And I've heard my aunt
> Along the corridor,
> And my uncle gaunt
> Lock his chamber door ;
>
> And upon the stair
> All is hushed and still,
> And the last wheel
> Is silent on the square ;
>
> And the nurses snore,
> And the dim sheets rise and fall,
> And the lamplight's on the wall,
> And the mouse is on the floor ;
>
> And the curtains of my bed
> Are like a heavy cloud,
> And the clock ticks loud,
> And sounds are in my head.

It is true that his characters, or rather his mouthpieces, moralize without any provocation, but now and then a shorter piece comes with the genuine note, like " Tommy's Dead," or " The Milkmaid's Song," or " The Market-Wife's Song." The anthologists have marked the first of these three, but not the other two. Yet they prove Dobell's ability to enter into a single character and be, for a while, dramatic. It was a limited ability, but it was authentic, as authentic as his descriptive powers. I shall illustrate the latter from the lines in which he compares the Coliseum to

Some mighty captive
Upon his death-bed in a Christian land,
And lying, through the chant of psalm and creed,
Unshriven and stern with peace upon his brow,
And on his lips strange gods.

Better still, perhaps, is his picture of the small hare,

Large-eyed and passionately afraid,
That peepeth from the covert of her nest
Into the narrow glade
Between two woods, and doth a moment dare
The sunshine, and leap back; yet forth will fare
Again, and each time ventures further from the nest,
Till having passed the midst ere she be 'ware,
Bold with fear to be so much confest,
She flees across the sun into the other shade.

You see that hare. The sketch is a trifle overdone, but it is transparent.

Dobell, like the rest of the spasmodic school, probably suffered from the uncritical enthusiasm of men like George Gilfillan. Even so sympathetic a critic as James Smetham seems to have been cold. "I used to dislike the *Festus* and *Balder* tone considerably," Smetham wrote in 1868, "and the only book I ever flung to the other side of the room was *Festus*. I never could get far enough into Dobell to come across his real merits," and then he makes an exception in favour of the "Keith of Ravelston" ballad. It would be a good subject for confession, "Books I have flung across the room!" But no one would throw Dobell's poems about in this way. Their merits may be slight, but they are, as I have said, real.

However, if Smith and Dobell have been unduly neglected as poets in these days of the reaction against things Victorian, they have done something in prose which lasts. Smith's two volumes of essays and sketches, *Dreamthorp* and *A Summer in Skye*, are still reprinted, and presumably read. And in 1850 a review of *Wuthering Heights* appeared in the *Palladium*, a short-lived periodical of the day. It mistook the novel for an early work of Charlotte Brontë, but it was one of the first pieces in England to recognize the genius of Emily Brontë's story. Charlotte was deeply encouraged by the praise of her sister's work. "I need not say," she wrote to a friend, "how I felt the remarks on *Wuthering Heights*; they woke the saddest yet most grateful feelings; they are true, they are discriminating, they are full of late justice, but it is very late—alas! in one sense, too late. Whoever the author of this article may be, I remain his debtor." The author was Sydney Dobell.

JAMES MOFFATT.

THE SPIRITUAL MEANING OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM

Biblical criticism has become, in the course of the last thirty or forty years, the common possession of virtually the whole Protestant world. It is taught in our theological colleges ; it has been welcomed by a large majority of the clergy and by multitudes of Christian laymen for the light it throws on the realities of the past[1] ; it is widely used by progressive teachers in our day- and Sunday-schools. At the same time, it has caused great perplexity to many ; and to-day, both in England and America, serious attempts are being made to discredit it. Its assailants are reaffirming the alternative theory of the literal inspiration of the whole Bible ; and thus a new lease of life is being given to a venerable doctrine abandoned, not only by so strong a traditionalist as Gladstone,[2] but since his time by the vast majority of educated Christians.

Some share of responsibility for the present controversy undoubtedly rests on our own shoulders. We have complacently accepted and used the findings of criticism, without realizing what a revolutionary change these proceedings involved in our religious universe. For the acceptance of criticism, in however small a measure, in place of the old literalism, implies a radically new theory of the sources of religious knowledge ; and it is therefore hardly to be wondered at that many people are shy and slow at receiving it. The old sheet-anchor of scriptural trustworthiness is to be a sheet-anchor no longer ; the bed-rock foundation is no longer bed-rock ; the thin end of the wedge has got in, and how far is it going to be pushed ? We have drifted from the old moorings ; what guarantee have we that we shall not be swept out on to the high seas of sceptical insecurity ? [3] Strangely enough, the nature of the crisis has been clearer to the literalist than it has to the critic. Critical Bible-students have been more concerned to pursue their fruitful investigations than to satisfy their fellow-believers as to their authority for doing so. We have not appreciated the fact that the use of the critical method means the adoption of a new religious astronomy ; and the onus therefore is upon us of expounding the new system of the Copernican critic and showing how it gives us as good and safe

[1] Cf. R. F. Horton in Congregational Quarterly, October 1923, pp. 397 f.

[2] In the preface to *The People's Bible History* (published 1896) : " Absolute inerrability cannot be maintained." " Sufficiency rather than absolute mechanical perfection is characteristic of God's provision for His ends." (Cf, *Review of Reviews*, June 1896, p. 561.)

[3] Cf. A. T. Cadoux, *Essays in Christian Thinking*, p. 80.

a place in God's universe as was provided by the older system of the Ptolemaic literalist.

This task is not quite the same as that of enumerating the various forcible objections that may reasonably be taken to the older literalist view.[1] If the question were simply one of historical probability, it could be easily settled. But the appeal to historical probability alone does not satisfy the religious interest of the literalist. He claims to stand on a foundation " built below the tide of " purely historical criticism; and his position is not answered until the true nature of that foundation has been laid bare.

Supposing then we ask the convinced literalist to give us the real basis of his belief in the inerrancy of Scripture, what would he say? Clearly he could not satisfy us with the simple statement that he had been taught so to believe, or with the plea (even supposing it were true in point of fact, which it is not) that the Bible claimed such authority for itself. For if that were all, we should want to know in what respect his grounds for accepting the Bible were stronger than the Hindu's grounds for accepting Hinduism or the Moslem's for accepting Mohammedanism. The sacred writings of most religions claim inspiration for themselves, or else have it claimed for them by their adherents.[2] If our friend allowed himself to be pressed, he could not ultimately avoid confessing that he believed the Scriptures to be the Word of God because they tallied with and re-echoed the Divine within himself. In the last analysis, the ground for the literalist's faith is not, " Because it is so written," but because what is written evokes the approving recognition of his own inward sense of the Divine.[3]

We reach a similar conclusion when we reflect upon the habit of all Christians (including literalists) of selecting and preferring certain parts of Scripture and setting aside (perhaps tacitly) certain other parts. Orthodox Christians were long unwilling to admit that they did this. Thus George Jacob Holyoake, the famous secularist, said in a public debate: " Every time . . . you defend one passage by another, every time you take me to a passage, and tell me I must not take that doctrine as literal because it seems so cruel or so immoral, you then do just what we do—you make a selection of the Bible, discarding some parts, and retaining others." It is clear from the record of the debate that his Christian opponent made no adequate or candid admission of this plea.[4] Henry Rogers, in his

[1] An excellent statement of these is given by E. Griffith-Jones in Peake's *Commentary*, pp. 3 f.

[2] A. E. Garvie in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, xiv. p. 646a.

[3] A. T. Cadoux, *Christian Thinking*, pp. 82 f.: " When we ask how are we to know what writings are inspired, we are driven to find the criterion in the response they evoke from something within us: " etc.

[4] *Christianity and Secularism* (1853), p. 211.

famous *Eclipse of Faith*,[1] denies anyone's right to accept a part of the teaching of the Bible, and reject other parts. Yet obviously such a choice is necessary. Even the literalist, though unconsciously and with disavowals, exercises it. He prefers the Psalms and the Gospels to Leviticus and Joshua ; he will leave unused the genealogies of Chronicles even if, as a pious duty, he reads them. We do not complain of his doing so ; but we must ask, By what authority is this choice exercised ? Clearly it is inconsistent with belief in the Bible as the *ultimate* authority : for if an authority is really ultimate, you cannot draw distinctions between one part of it and another ; it is then all equally true and equally instructive. If you do draw distinctions, that shows that you are using some test of truth and value ulterior to that of the Scriptures themselves. That test is clearly the inward sense of the Divine—the same faculty as that on which rests our acceptance of the Bible as a whole. " We get good only from those parts of Scripture that call out this inward response." [2] This selective operation, so often stigmatized as " picking and choosing," is as real in the case of the literalist as in that of the critic, is logically prior to any theory about inspiration, and is inconsistent with belief in the infallibility and consequently ultimate authority of Scripture.

Those, then, who " criticize " Scripture, to however moderate a degree, must frankly abandon all talk about Scripture being our final authority or ultimate basis, however we may express it.[3] We must boldly declare that, invaluable as Scripture is, the final court of appeal resides within, in those powers whereby God has made us like to Himself—in the light of reason, the love of truth, and the sense of right and wrong.

Often as this view has been adumbrated, it has yet never been worked out with sufficient clearness and thoroughness to secure general appreciation and acceptance on the part of Christians. It is at least as old as Calvin, with his doctrine of the *testimonium internum Spiritus Sancti*.[4] We get it in John Locke [5], in the Deists,[6] in

[1] Pp. 343 f., 346.

[2] A. T. Cadoux, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

[3] Yet the Bishops at Lambeth in 1920 proposed—as one of the conditions of Christian Reunion—" the whole-hearted acceptance of the Holy Scriptures . . . as being the rule and *ultimate standard of faith*." The Baptists at Stockholm in 1923 stated : " There are various ways of stating the *fundamental Baptist principle*. If we indicate *the source* of our knowledge, we say the Scriptures . . . are divinely inspired and are our sufficient, *certain and authoritative guide in all matters of faith and practice* " (Italics mine).

[4] *Institutio* I. iii. 3, v. 3, vii. 2, 4 f., viii, 13, ix. 3 ; Fisher, *Hist. Christian Doctr.*, p. 299 ; J. A. Robertson in *Expositor*, September 1922, pp. 219 f.

[5] A. C. Fraser, *Locke*, p. 257.

[6] " Do not these instances . . . plainly show . . . that we sin against that Reason, which was given us to distinguish between Good and Evil ; Religion and Superstition ; if we do not by it examine all Doctrines whatsoever, and by whomsoever deliver'd ? " (Matthew Tindal, quoted in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 409.)

the Quaker belief in the Inner Light. We find it in Victorian thought, and that not among theologians only.[1] That pioneer of Biblical criticism, W. Robertson Smith, said: "If I am asked why I receive Scripture as the Word of God . . . I answer . . . 'Because the Bible is the only record of the redeeming love of God. . . . And this record I know to be true by the witness of His Spirit in my heart, whereby I am assured that none other but God Himself is able to speak such words to my soul.'"[2] Probably James Martineau did more than any other single writer to explain and defend this view of the authority of Scripture; and his work, *The Seat of Authority in Religion* (1890), will always rank as a classic statement of it.[3] But others also, of more unimpeachable orthodoxy, have taught the same doctrine, though on the whole in a less thoroughgoing manner. Thus A. B. Bruce gives a somewhat qualified approval to Calvin's theory as "making us independent both of the authority of the Church, and of all external questions as to authorship."[4] "God," he says, "may inspire men who commit what we deem literary sins, . . . for books of the Bible in which these so-called literary sins are committed bear all the marks of inspiration—the divine in us bearing witness to the divine in them."[5] Dr. Garvie approves of Calvin's theory as one "wide enough to leave room for our growing modern knowledge of the Bible."[6] One of the latest utterances of Dr. George Milligan on the function of Biblical Criticism contained these words: "Clearly the Book, which is the result of the Spirit's working upon the minds and hearts of men, can yield up its full treasures only to those who approach its study under the same Divine guidance."[7]

[1] Thus Mrs. Craik's *Olive* (1850) is made to say: "I follow no ritual, and trust no creed, except so far as it is conformable to the instinct of faith—the inward revelation of Himself which He has implanted in my soul" (p. 274). Cf. Rowland Williams, in *Essays and Reviews* (1860): "We are obliged to assume in ourselves a verifying faculty, not unlike the discretion which a mathematician would use in weighing a treatise on geometry, or the liberty which a musician would reserve in reporting a law of harmony. Thus, as we are expressly told, we are to have the witness in ourselves. It is not our part to dictate to Almighty God, that He ought to have spared us this strain upon our consciences" (p. 83.)

[2] Quoted by Garvie in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, xiv. p. 647b.

[3] Cf. also his *Essays, Reviews and Addresses*, iv. pp. 323–326.

[4] *Apologetics*, p. 320. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 310.

[6] In *Encyclopædia Britannica*, xiv. p. 647b.; cf. the closing remarks of the article, p. 648a. Cf. also E. Griffith-Jones in Peake's *Commentary* (p. 8a): "Out of the Bible a Divine Voice speaks, and, *when the authentic accent of that voice comes home to us*, we cannot for a moment doubt that we are face to face with the ultimate authority over the human soul." (Italics mine.)

[7] In *Expositor*, December 1921, p. 424. Cf. J. A. Robertson in *Expositor*, September 1922, pp. 216–219 ("Even the Roman communion admits that the soul with its inner testimony of the Spirit is the ultimate seal of authority," etc.,etc.); A. T. Cadoux, *Christian Thinking*, pp. 81–83 ("Most Christians would agree that without the aid of the Holy Spirit in our hearts we read the Scripture in vain—a confession which makes all other authority attend upon one inward to the individual man"), 89; L. P. Jacks in *Hibbert Journal*, January 1923, p. 385 ("To show me the Divine in human

There is thus a fairly solid body of precedents for the view that the ultimate authority in the spiritual life is not the Bible as such, or anything else external to man, but the direct testimony of God's Spirit in man's own mind and heart. Let us now see what this basic position involves.

1. It involves, in the first place, the constant need and use of all available external objective authorities. It is the more important to insist on this, as the contrary has often been assumed to be the case. Thus Bruce says of Martineau: "When a man happens to believe that he can do without an objective light of the world, he can afford to be very sceptical as to the existence of such a light—nay, if he be in a small minority in maintaining the sufficiency of the inner light, he may be tempted to raise a mist of doubt about the sun that no alternative may be left but to trust in the guidance of the candle." [1] The mystics are often suspected of repudiating all external authority, and their method is criticized as too vague and subjective: the best mystics, it is urged, are those that have been nurtured in an atmosphere of objective religion; uncorrected by some such independent standard, they are declared to be unreliable guides. They often differ from one another in their reading of the Will of God; and then, who is to judge between them?

Probably some justification for these criticisms may be found in the foolishness of certain exponents of the doctrine in question.[2] At the same time, they reveal a failure to grasp the true psychology of the mystic's inner light. All that is claimed for it is that it is the foundation, not the whole structure; that it is the lens, not the thing seen or photographed. Without it, we are without vision and without home; but having it, we must use it on the objective world of nature and history, if by means of it we are to have access to God.[3] We cannot, by virtue of the inner light *alone*, through prayer and meditation, discover the Nature and Will of God. We stand to lose heavily if we neglect that universe of human experiences wherein God has not left Himself without a witness. But we do claim that in searching for this witness, in sifting the data of science, in appraising the religious and moral teaching of others, and in interpreting history, the individual must be guided by his mystical

form would mean nothing new to me if I were unequipped with the capacity to recognize the Divine when I saw it. . . . Does not my power to identify the Object before me with God presuppose in me that very knowledge of God which is said to be drawn inferentially from the proposition that 'Christ is God'? Are we not in danger of circular reasoning at this point?").

[1] *Apologetics*, pp. 342 f.

[2] E.g. Mark Pattison says that, in the eighteenth century, "the inner light which had made each man the dictator of his own creed, had exploded in ecclesiastical anarchy," and "fallen into discredit through the extravagances to which it had given birth." (*Essays and Reviews*, p. 291.)

[3] Gladly we concede the plea of Henry Rogers that capacity to receive a revelation from God is not the same thing as receiving that revelation. (*Eclipse of Faith*, p. 248.)

grasp of God, his rational sense of truth, and his moral feeling for what is right. It is a literal impossibility to make anyone but oneself responsible for the choice of one's teachers and the acceptance of their teaching. An untravelled Briton who wishes to learn about Central Africa cannot learn what he wants to know by the unaided use of the inner light. He will need objective authorities; he will question explorers or read their books. But his private judgment still remains his ultimate authority, for no explorer can teach him anything unless and until he satisfies himself that the explorer is competent, truthful, and therefore trustworthy. The fact that he knows nothing at first hand about Africa does not cancel this ultimacy of his private judgment. What, for instance, would he say to an explorer who should tell him on personal testimony that in Central Africa men live without breathing, or that two and two there make five?

It is therefore a mistake to regard the inner light as one in a group of co-ordinate sources of information. On the one hand, it does not enable us to dispense with external authorities; on the other hand, in all learning from external authorities, it is the constant guide to, and ultimate test of, reliability. When, therefore, the question is asked, "Who shall judge between the mystics?" the only possible answer is, not the Church, nor any "atmosphere of objective religion," but the mystically minded questioner himself.

A word may be added in regard to the special case of the authority of the Church. The "inner light" means the inner light of the individual, not that of the community, which is sometimes eirenically suggested as an acceptable substitute for it.[1] At the same time the individual has no right to ignore what God has to say to him through His other children. Martineau, so far from wishing to substitute his candle for the sun, had explicitly repudiated the solipsism with which Bruce charged him. "No doubt," he says, "it must always rest with the individual reason and conscience to pronounce the personal verdict of true or false; but the pleadings on which they decide are fetched from the gathered stores of Christian and heathen wisdom . . ., and, when seeming to flow immediately from a single mind, are rendered possible there only by a traceless myriad of influences infiltrating into it from earlier time."[2] "The inward authority lacks content except through fellowship, and the

[1] As e.g. by J. A. Robertson in *Expositor*, September 1922, p. 217 ("the heart and conscience of the living Church of believers must still hold themselves free to make their own spirit-guided judgments as to . . . the authority of Scripture. . . ."); 222 ("Not man in his solitude, be it said, lest we be thought to minimize the place of the Church in this experience, but the believer within the Fellowship of Faith . . . the Church Catholic").

[2] *Essays, Reviews and Addresses*, iv. p. 117; cf. iii. p. 50.

authority of the Church is its experienced power to evoke and bring into exercise this inward authority of its members." [1]

2. Our doctrine involves the unimpaired authority of Christ. Only it requires—not indeed a disjunction—but a distinction to be made between the Jesus of history and the mystically present Christ. The latter is to be identified with the inner light. We know that for many the testimony of the Spirit takes on that personal colour which compels them to call it the voice of their indwelling Lord. Nor is there any occasion to deny to such language objective justification. But Paul's identification of the Lord and the Spirit proves this experience of Christ to be *in essence* the same as that of every enlightened mystic. Of the Jesus of history, however, we cannot say exactly the same as we do of the Christ of experience. We can, indeed, say of Him that, among all the witnesses God has given of Himself in history, He is unique in the clarity and potency of His message.[2] So unparalleled has been this authority of His, that His recorded life and teaching have not unnaturally been declared to be the bed-rock foundation of Christian faith. The confession made by Olive Rothesay in Mrs. Craik's novel is typical of the ordinary Christian's account of the matter. She co-ordinates the historical Jesus with her own instinctive faith as the two ultimates, and tests every creed, not only by God's inward revelation, but also by " that outward revelation, the nearest and clearest that He has ever given of Himself to men, the Divine revelation of love which I find here, in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, my Lord." [3] Such a fusing of the historical figure with the inward spirit may be a helpful approximation for Christians generally; but it is inexact, and therefore likely to give rise to perplexity. Priceless as is God's witness to Himself in the history of Jesus, we must not claim for that history an absolute finality and certainty which no history can possess. We can reconstruct the history with a high degree of probability; we cannot give to it the absoluteness which faith demands for its ultimate foundation.[4] Such absoluteness belongs only to the spiritual apprehension of God by means of that receptiveness with which He has endowed the human spirit.[5]

3. Our doctrine, in the third place, involves the recognition of an

[1] A. T. Cadoux, *Christian Thinking*, p. 84.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 89. Cf. the confession of Martineau (*Essays*, etc., iii. p. 51).

[3] See above, p. 187, note 1. So, too, Luther (as expounded by H. R. Mackintosh, *Person of Jesus Christ*, p. 232). Cf. Garvie, *The Beloved Disciple*, p. 258.

[4] " To represent religion as depending on the historical accuracy of various statements is to ignore altogether the evidence which each man carries within him of the presence of God. This is the only evidence that counts " [i.e. in the *ultimate* sense], " and but for it religion could only be a mockery of what it is." (J. S. Haldane in *Hibbert Journal*, April 1923, p. 434.)

[5] See the quotation from L. P. Jacks above, p. 187.

element of fallibility in all our detailed judgments about God. The personal factor qualifies all our reading of the inner light. That is why the inner light, for all its ultimacy, does not render the individual possessor of it infallible, and so bring him into unfailing agreement with others who possess it. Those who, like Henry Rogers, are dissatisfied with our doctrine, are fond of making merry over the endless discrepancies to be found in the conclusions of its supporters.[1] But however grievous such discrepancies may be, we do not mend our case by affirming pragmatically that we possess an infallibility we do not possess, or by selecting (on grounds that are really all the time subjective) some particular book or document or piece of history, and claiming that as an inerrant and complete deposit of truth. *All* experience has its subjective as well as its objective qualification ; and if you insist on striking out the subjective qualification, you simply strike out the experience as well. If you wish to keep the experience, you have no choice but to keep its subjective conditions : and that means that the personal factor, the sum-total of our individual character and being, will, in certain ways we cannot exactly measure, always enter in to make our experience of objective reality what it is.[2] But that does not mean that knowledge of objective reality, sufficient for our need, is beyond our reach. Physical sight is qualified by the strength of our eyes, our angle of vision, our distance from the objects we look at ; our hearing is limited and sometimes deceptive because our ears are necessarily ears of a particular kind, functioning under particular conditions : yet sight and hearing are amply good enough to enable us to get about and to do our work. So, too, our vision of the infinite God cannot help being subject to the limits of our finite intelligence. The cupfuls we take from the great ocean cannot help assuming the shape of our cup. But the oneness and the goodness of the universe of God far outweigh the possible sprinkling of personal error, and bestow upon us, in return for honest quest, not an exhaustive and infallible system of truth, but light and guidance sufficient for the day. The fact that the vessels are earthen—often very earthen indeed—dismays us not, so long as we may know that they hold the real treasure.

What then shall we say to these things ? If God be for us, how can the critic be against us ? If God has sent forth His Spirit into our hearts, whereby we cry, " Abba ! Father ! ", how can the honest

[1] *Eclipse of Faith*, pp. 342 f., 346 f., 349, 354, 357.

[2] I cannot see that this conclusion is invalidated by the various older and newer anti-idealist arguments referred to by Canon O. C. Quick in *Hibbert Journal*, October 1923, pp. 123 f. It is not an adequate account of the matter to say : " What is known, the true *cognitum*, remains quite unaffected by the cognitive relation . . . the plain man is right after all, that when the mind makes any contribution to the thing known which is not already in the thing itself, the result is error or illusion, and not true knowledge at all."

and untrammelled search for God's truth put us further away from Him? For Biblical criticism is simply "the application of truly scientific methods to Biblical study," [1] and scientific methods are simply those canons of historical and literary probability which we regularly use and trust as a means of arriving at the Truth in regard to the past. Criticism claims that it must be allowed to finish its task on the data, which consist of the records accessible to it, before the theologian and philosopher begin to weave their theories and doctrines out of the history.[2] It claims that natural explanations of the data must be exhausted before recourse is had to theories of miraculous or even exceptional providences. It insists that account be taken of the psychological state of ancient witnesses and writers, of their credulity, ignorance, and fallibility, their prejudices and special interests, as well as of their trustworthiness. In regard to miracles, the critic does not start—as is often supposed—with an *a priori* assumption that miracles are impossible and narratives recounting them therefore fictitious: he starts with the world of nature and humanity as known to him not exhaustively, but extensively. He does not ask, "Is this miracle conceivable?" Even to answer such a question affirmatively takes one but a little way towards the Truth.[3] He asks: "Given the existence of the narrative, which is the more probable, that the historical ground for it included a miracle, or that it did not?" As every candid historian has to do, he refuses to accord belief to a statement unless there is sufficient evidence to make its truth at least more probable than its untruth. As a spiritually-minded man, he reserves to himself the right to refuse credence to beliefs about God and duty which do violence to his most clear and sacred personal convictions. In thus trusting his own judgment of what is historically true and religiously and morally right, the critic may, of course, make mistakes; but in essence he is doing precisely what our Lord Himself and many a New Testament author did, in making free selective use of the Old Testament,[4] and what the early Christians did in fashioning their own Canon.[5] Criticism takes its stand on the self-consistency of Truth in a Divinely governed universe, on the supreme duty of loyalty to Truth, and of the supreme ultimate advantage

[1] Milligan in *Expositor*, December 1921, p. 412.

[2] So E. Griffith-Jones in Peake's *Commentary*, p. 3a.

[3] "There is a story that when the sculptures were first excavated in the Assyrian palaces, the Arabs believed that Allah had put them there, and that when doubt was cast on this explanation, the answer was, 'Well, could He not have done so?' (on which . . . the Victorian relator of the story commented . . . with the words, 'which was unanswerable')." (*Times Literary Supplement*, April 19, 1923, p. 258.)

[4] H. Weinel says of Jesus's use of the O.T.: "ihm ist gewiss, dass Gott hier deutlicher spricht als da." (*Bibl. Theol. des N.T.*, p. 91; cf. pp. 157 f.)

[5] Milligan in *Expositor*, December 1921, pp. 415 f. Theodoros of Mopsuestia, like Luther, recognized different degrees of inspiration as attaching to different books of Scripture. (Hastings, *E.R.E.*, i. pp. 585 f.).

of attaining it.[1] The quest of Truth is sometimes a painful process; but over against the discomfort and shock of having to abandon old beliefs stands the still more serious penalty of drifting away from God through a timid unwillingness to face facts. "In the West," says Dr. Glover, "we sometimes see men with paralysed minds calling themselves Christians, as proud of the withered intellect as the Sannyasi of his ruined arm."[2] "We need to have new experience; we have to be dissatisfied with our range in Truth; we have to explore beyond it. All men who know and love Truth know that; and what can they think of a Christian Church, where that Spirit is suspect?"[3] Nor does the danger of timidity affect ourselves only. It involves the risk of imperilling the nascent faith of others by giving them the impression that Christianity is not for them unless they are prepared to put their love of Truth quietly into their pockets.

A word or two further is due by way of reply to one or two of the weightier objections that are brought to-day against the critical position.

1. Thus, Fundamentalists are fond of pointing to the endless disagreement of critics on many points of Biblical inquiry. But such divergences are what one expects in a field of history where the data are often scanty, and the possible conclusions numerous. Moreover, as in secular history, the area of disagreement is small compared with that of agreement, and naturally concerns the details rather than the main outlines.

2. Again, the advancement of a certain number of "wild theories" no more discredits criticism than the necessary abandonment of exploded scientific hypotheses discredits science. Fertility of speculation is a valuable asset in the study of history, as of science. It is, indeed, bound to produce a certain proportion of extravagant suggestions; but these are quite capable of being eliminated by constant reference to positive data, and by the general progress of inquiry over the whole field. "The sins of critics no more impair the authority of criticism than the sins of Churchmen impair the right of the Church to exist."[4]

3. There have been recently one or two reversions on the part of critics towards traditional views as opposed to those previously held rather widely in critical circles. Perhaps the most noteworthy of these was Harnack's pronouncements, in 1906 and the following years, in favour of the Lucan authorship of the third Gospel and

[1] P. N. Harrison has some great words on this last point in his *Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, p. 3. On the gains of Biblical criticism generally, cf. Milligan, *op cit.*, pp. 420–423.

[2] *Jesus in the Experience of Men*, p. 144.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 238.

[4] Nash, quoted by Milligan, *Expositor*, December 1921, p. 413. Cf. the latter's remarks, *ibid.*, pp. 414 f.

the whole of Acts. These instances have been hailed by conservatives as a confession of defeat on the part of New Testament criticism and an evidence of the bankruptcy of the critical method.[1] Such rejoicings are premature. These occurrences merely confirm what we knew already, viz. that previous criticism was not infallible. So far are they from discrediting the methods of criticism, that it is precisely by the use of these methods that they have been arrived at; nor do they re-establish in any way the old theory of the inerrancy of Scripture, or prove the uniform accuracy of traditional views as to New Testament authorship generally. Dr. Milligan observes, in regard to this recent return to certain older positions, "Here is the gain; these positions are now no longer based on mere tradition or authority, but on the most thorough-going scientific inquiry, and are therefore enabled to secure an acceptance in many quarters which was formerly denied them."[2] It is therefore a mistake to suppose "that the present healthy reaction against the extreme scepticism of an earlier period is leading us back to the outlook of pre-critical days."[3]

4. Dr. Charles Harris has recently[4] propounded a distinction between sound objective criticism, based on obvious data, and mischievous subjective or modernist criticism, based on the insecure foundation of Kantian philosophy. Examples of the former are the documentary theories of the Pentateuch and the Synoptic Gospels—of the latter, the general liberal interpretation of the Gospel story. Now, widely accepted critical conclusions no doubt vary in the degrees of their approach to certainty; but they cannot be separated like this into two classes. Both of the two kinds of criticism to which Dr. Harris refers are subjective, in the sense that they presuppose the reliability of the critical faculty in man; both are objective, in that they concern themselves with features in the record itself. It is hard to see that the criticism he rejects has anything more to do with Kant than the criticism he accepts; and the latter was as much anathema to the orthodox of fifty years ago, and is to-day as much anathema to the Romanist and the Fundamentalist, as the former.[5] The method on which both varieties rest is the same in principle; and if wrong conclusions have been arrived at, they can be corrected only by a more careful use of the same method, not by an abandonment of all so-called subjective criticism as such.

On the whole we have no reason to be impatient or distressed about the opposition with which Biblical criticism is meeting. It

[1] A. C. McGiffert in *Beginnings of Christianity*, ii. p. 393. Cf. e.g. Jas. Stalker's Article on "A Revolution in New Testament Criticism" in *Expositor*, November 1920, pp. 348–363.

[2] *Expositor*, December 1921, p. 421.

[3] J. M. Creed in *Journal of Theological Studies*, April 1923, pp. 352 f.

[4] In *Creeds or no Creeds* (Murray, 1922).

[5] Cf. J. M. Creed, *loc. cit.*

ensures us against the hasty acceptance of untested and dubious hypotheses. But it is further helpful in putting us upon our mettle, in driving us back to our foundations, in sounding to us a wholesome challenge to find and declare a reason for the faith that is in us. Such reason we have found ; such reason can we give—gladly yet not defiantly ; with confidence, yet not with scorn ; not only to justify ourselves, but to assist, as well as to reconcile, others. The stress of controversy, the pain of mutual offence, the humbling disquietude of having sometimes to confess uncertainty and ignorance—these are but the price we have to pay for a blessing that is beyond all price. For what price is not worth paying in order to procure a deeper insight into the ways of God with us ? What disappointment is not worth while, if it be but a means whereby our contact with God is made more real and close, our confidence in Him transferred from a shaky to an unshakable foundation ? His ways with us are truly reflected in Nature's ways. The grim intractability of Nature has to be wrestled with and overcome ; and often it is a sorry struggle : the farmer goeth forth on his way weeping, bearing forth his seed. But Nature's opposition is also her invitation : he shall come again with joy, bringing his sheaves with him. So with God, as men have to learn of Him through the Bible. In the good old days, our whole theological system seemed to be well and truly built. And then criticism came ; and at its icy touch the foundations of man's faith began to crumble into dust, and he seemed to timid eyes likely to be left naked and adrift in a Godless world. But behold ! the old foundations were loosened, only that the firmer basis on which they had rested might be brought to light. Our faith is not weaker, but stronger—not less accessible to the minds of others, but more accessible—now that we have been taught that its sheet-anchor is the self-authenticating witness of God within us, assuring us that we are His children and interpreting Himself to us, not only in His fair creation, but in all the truthful words spoken, and all the loving and noble deeds done, in the present and in the past alike. God is His own interpreter ; and if we are in direct touch with Him, no fresh accession of historical or religious Truth can fright our faith. The Bible becomes not less, but more, of a blessing to us when, in and by our study of it, we are brought not only to a fuller and truer vision of God's witness to Himself in history, but to a more conscious and intimate dependence upon Him.

C. J. Cadoux.

DR. WHYTE AS I REMEMBER HIM

WHEN my father died in November 1868 I was a little boy of ten. Within a few months the family had removed sadly to the great city of Glasgow, and the attractions of Alexander Whyte, the junior pastor of Free St. John's, were being strongly felt. It surprises me to recall how the children of our home were called into council before a decision was finally reached. My general impression would have been that authority ruled all such matters, and that a child's part in those days was mere acquiescence. But it was not so; I can recall my own half-surly concurrence—Whyte's ministry did not specially appeal to a child of eleven. Before very long, however, my brother and I were rivalling older and wiser heads in enthusiasm. A sister has told me with what quiet amusement they watched us swinging round. We used to quote his phrases: "Isaac had done his poor best" to thwart the divine will in regard to birthright blessings; Judas "made his handful of accursed silver RING along the temple floor and went away and [*sotto voce*] hanged himself."

The happiness of family and congregation was soon interrupted. Edinburgh secured Whyte for the distinguished position of colleague and successor to Dr. R. S. Candlish in the pastorate of Free St. George's; and seven eventful years passed before we removed to Edinburgh, and recovered our minister. Thereafter during four consecutive sessions of theological study, and for some shorter periods within the next decade, I was a member of his "great congregation."

Whyte's friends considered that he was "wonderful" as a revival preacher. I remember once, and only once, hearing him deliver what was announced as an evangelistic address. He was visiting a Glasgow church during those early Edinburgh years while he was lost to us, and he spoke from the words *If I make my bed in hell.* Untrammelled by reference to the original meaning of the psalm—untrammelled (perhaps rightly so) by his Calvinistic creed—he taught us plainly that, if we made our way to the place of torment, it would be through our own action; the grim accompanying suggestion was that most of us were diligently making a bed for ourselves in that evil place.

About the same time a well-known religious monthly of those days introduced a new feature—the "Alpha-Beta Guild." Distinguished men, each signing his contributions with a Greek capital letter, were to submit short and comparatively irresponsible papers.

"Alpha" wrote on "My Ministerial Compensations." When my mother had read the article, she pencilled on the margin "Mr. W.?" My sisters and I were indignant. The style which told so well in the pulpit appeared strangely exuberant in print. But my mother was right, and more than right. The paper was Whyte, as the phrase goes, "all over," alike in thought and in expression. The same endowments which made a Chalmers and a Gladstone so great in oratory make them almost unreadable [1] in literature; and Whyte, who shared in their quality, shared something of their defect. I need scarcely add that the "Guild" was short-lived. No editor can afford to conceal the names of first-class contributors.

Changes had come to Whyte himself before 1877. Dr. Candlish had died; Whyte was now at the zenith of his powers, physical and mental, and was grappling single-handed with duties which might have taxed to the utmost a pair of robust colleagues. I do not remember then the outside queues by which the church was beset in later years, but I well remember crowds of strangers thronging the spacious vestibule. I am speaking of forty years since and more. Conditions have indeed changed greatly since then. Hymns —Part III in a poor collection of *Psalm-Versions, Paraphrases and Hymns*—were barely tolerated in the Free Church of Scotland. Organs were not legitimated until 1883. How the denomination handicapped itself in these externals! A choir of voluntary singers used to lead the praise, unaccompanied. The offertory was received, in the old Scottish fashion, as the congregation entered. I have stood as a deacon by the plate while the worshippers arrived, dropping in their contributions quietly at first, then—as the hour of service approached—flinging them in noisily as they trooped past.

My appointment as a deacon—i.e. in Presbyterianism, as a junior office-bearer specially charged with finance—led to a little very confidential talk with my minister. My lot was to find myself in sight of my first serious theological difficulties between the date of my original acceptance of office and the date of (what was called) our ordination. In reporting my recoil from the doctrine of the eternity of punishment I was startled to find how sympathetically Whyte met me. He urged me to regard creed subscription as implying less than I had thought. I said that I should be glad to share his view of the matter if I could "get leave" to do so. "Well, well," said he, "I would take leave. But," he added, "some people, when you question the doctrine, you would think you were taking from them their own eternal salvation." In the end I was persuaded to sign; but my difficulties were only postponed. When they found their solution, years afterwards, in my settlement

[1] This is not true of Burke; but Burke's genius defies all generalizations. And was Burke equally successful at the moment? Not in the House of Commons, according to *Retaliation*.

as Congregational pastor at Dumfries, a gracious letter of goodwill was read from Dr. Whyte. "It's not lost," he wrote, "what a friend gets."

Dr. Whyte's pulpit prayers were much criticized by some because of their suffusion with personal moods. To my own thinking, this criticism was overdone. Certainly Whyte did not belong to the old bad school of literally extemporaneous devotion, whose method has been described as "feeling about until they struck a vein, and working it until it was exhausted: when they stopped." There was unmistakable preparation of our minister's mind and heart for so solemn a duty. I recall a service during Lord Lytton's Afghan War when prayers was offered for "our poor soldiers on the mountains of Afghanistan this cold wintry day," with the addition, "we are not *all*-ways in the right"—a clear indication of political sympathies or antipathies. One wholly admirable feature of Whyte's public prayers was his commendation to God of any special charity for which our alms were asked. The collection of the offerings might be relegated to the vestibule, but their presentation to God, at such times, was an act of reverent worship.

Sunday morning sermons—"lectures" rather, in the old-fashioned Scottish sense—were carefully written out and ran to a considerable length. They were often comments on Bible histories, terminating in practical applications: "Upon this I remark in the first place," and then "in the second place"; and so on. In the light of the tragic story of David's family ("We have no contemporaneous polygamy among us, but we have successive polygamy") lessons were suggested for those contemplating a second marriage. ("For your children's good, if at all; not for your own happiness.") When he dealt with the story of Naaman, Whyte conjectured that the prophet might have hesitated to sanction the "two mules' burdens of earth" had he foreseen to what they would grow. "Shall I tell you what they have become?"—a pretty cousin said afterwards that she wanted to cry out, "Yes; do, do!"—"Shall I tell you? They are the Church and the State of Protestant England." It was in the days when the Burials Bill was meeting with cruel opposition. Having referred a second time to political matters, let me add that incursions into that region were infrequent and were not specially characteristic of Whyte. He lived in the light of the eternities, and struck home habitually to the deep places of the conscience.

A sermon upon Hosea's life-story opened with the arresting words, "The Bible was not easily written." And in a true sense, one felt, the Bible could not be easily preached. A friend remarked to me that Whyte did not hold his great position as "easily" as a predecessor in the colleague-pastorate at St. George's, Oswald Dykes, had done. Assuredly! Whyte did nothing easily. He put every

ounce of his exceptional strength into each effort as it had to be made. Was there not greatness in that ?

Upon the whole, my most striking recollections of sermons seem to belong to New Testament themes. There was an exposition of *Thou, when thou prayest,* regarding which a plain, almost dull, fellow-student remarked to me that it was deeply humbling and searching, without containing even one sentence which could give offence or do harm. This high praise could not always be awarded to Whyte, but to the sermon in question I judge that it was amply due. All the way home from listening to it I seemed to hear a voice saying in my heart, " There is none like him—none." Another sermon opened by sketching for us the thoughts of our Lord when He " awoke " on the morning of the third day in Joseph's tomb. So they had dressed Him in grave-clothes ! This was all that His patient teaching had achieved—they had loved Him, but they had put no faith in His victory ! And then, with a great sob of relief, the thought overwhelmed Him : It was finished ! All was finished, and the victory indeed was complete ! *Never more to suffer ; never more to die. . . .*

Another most remarkable sermon dealt with John 12, *Except a corn of wheat,* etc. In a characteristic exposition of " Except it die," we were admonished that our souls must be " drenched in the saving salt of self-hatred and self-contempt." Then came a burst of something much warmer on *I, if I be lifted up.* " Blessed be His name, He draws me—draws me as no other does ; not God, unless it be God in Christ ; not man, unless it be the man Christ Jesus ; and not even Christ Himself unless it be Christ crucified. All others say to me, What is that to us ? See thou to that. But He——" I cannot recall the words in which he expressed his sense of the love of his Lord and Saviour. But I do remember —how could I ever forget ?—the emphasis with which he announced our closing hymn :

I lay my sins on Jesus,
The spotless Lamb of God ;
He bears them all, and frees us
From the ACCURSED load.

The second service in those older days was held in the afternoon, the closing hours of the day being sacred to home religion or to Sunday-schools, or to Bible classes. Whyte himself held a young men's class, with miscellaneous syllabuses, late upon Sunday afternoon, repeating the same work with young women on a week-day. I have heard him say that Candlish had advised him—perhaps when he became colleague, more probably in those earlier days when he was a student and Candlish, though not a Professor, was College Principal [1]—to write out part, but only part, of his

[1] Like Whyte himself later on.

pulpit work. Accordingly, Whyte's afternoon sermons, with the week-night or "Prayer Meeting" addresses, were not written out. For most men Candlish's advice would have been excellent. But—as I have heard Whyte say, with his touching simplicity—"They tell me I should be more careful in preparation. But there's no use in my preparing if I'm to speak; for when I stand up everything goes out of my mind, and I just have to say what comes." [1] One recalls that Chatham could not keep Cabinet secrets when he got on his legs: everything came out. The parallel is not precise, but I think it is significant. The emotionalism of Whyte's uncontrolled spoken addresses became excessive, and friendly remonstrances ultimately led to his writing out at least the Sunday afternoon or evening addresses. Once written out, they found a ready welcome in the religious press; they were bound up into books; the preacher became an author—an author of immense popularity—and henceforth he commanded a vastly extended public. For, with slight though essential chastening, these written addresses preserved the main qualities of Whyte's spoken message. They burned with the same zeal. They vibrated with the same deep earnestness.

Personally, I think I owed as much to the Tuesday evenings as to the Sunday services, as an odd little sidelight suggests. There was one occasion when several of us received an invitation to a friend's house for a *Tuesday*. We talked things over, and took the liberty of excusing ourselves—frankly upon the ground that we did not wish to miss even one of Whyte's services. It was satisfactory to be told afterwards that the good man from whose house the invitation emanated was delighted to hear of such an answer.[2] Again and again I have gone to these meetings bewildered, restless, confortless; again and again I have returned humbled and softened and hopeful, thankful once more to submit myself to the yoke of Christ. The ministry which can do such things for worshippers is a true ministry of the gospel of grace. And, if I came through the hard days of youth and doubt without losing my hold upon the things that truly matter, I owe it mainly, under God, to that one voice and to that one place. Presbyterians and Nonconformists have no love for "consecrated" buildings. What need have we of such idle formalities? Over and over again the very unecclesiastical interior of that great hall proved to be indeed the house of God and the gate of heaven.

But that is not to say that the preacher always fed one with

[1] We still found his phrases quotable. "Rise *from your lounging attitude* and take down the volume of the Encyclopedia," was very useful at home. Another favourite, I fear, was: "Some poor soul who can hardly even *stagger* to the prayer-meeting."

[2] He belonged to a different congregation; it was not his, or his family's, "Prayer-Meeting night."

food convenient for one! When he expounded Bunyan's Slough of Despond as a parable of original sin, he made the parable dreadfully his own. We were to imagine all the sewage of Edinburgh collected in one vast cesspool below the church: "That's your heart, my brother—your heart, and mine!" At the Communion services the ordinary traditional observance of Fencing the Tables was maintained. Members began to arrive as early as forty-five minutes before the hour of public worship, in order to be sure of a place at the First Table. There, already seated, we listened to the Action Sermon. Then came the Fencing. If it had done its supposed work—if anyone's conscience had smitten him so that he withdrew because of conscious unworthiness, Whyte might perhaps have been pleased, but the Church as a whole would have been scandalized; indeed, it was an inconceivable event. Nevertheless the form was maintained; and I have heard Psalm 50 read as enumerating the duties required of Christians and the sins inconsistent with communicant membership. But the minister began to comment upon what he read; and before he was done with us his teaching was that, unless we were conscious of having broken in its finer spirit every one of God's laws, we showed such lamentable ignorance of our own hearts as unfitted us for the table of Christ. I do not deny that his message shook the conscience; but the text and the exposition were curiously contrasted. A similar specimen of extravagant exegesis occurred in a sermon upon the Rich Young Ruler. Whyte worked himself into a frenzy of indignation over the poor boy's "All these have I kept from my youth," and proceeded to impute to Jesus the same contempt and disgust for so unawakened a conscience. St. Mark is content to tell us that "Jesus beholding him loved him." I have always thought that A. B. Davidson's sermon on the same theme must have been meant as a protest against this dogmatic mercilessness.[1] "He was a lovely character." "Would you not rather be John than Paul, Cowper than Newton?" Nor did Davidson speak only smooth things. "We feel as if we had been looking on at a tragedy—as if we had been watching one struggling among the billows, almost finding foothold upon the rock, but at the last swept away. *Let us therefore fear.*"

If there was severity in Whyte towards those who fell short of full Puritan or Pauline standards, there was much that was sombre in his view of the normal Christian life. "Some people talk of getting out of the *miserable* seventh chapter of Romans. You'll never get out of the seventh of Romans while I'm your minister!"

[1] Davidson was said to have formulated Whyte in one of his stinging phrases: "Whyte analyses—with a hatchet." But

> Life is not rounded in an epigram,
> And, saying aught, we leave a world unsaid.

Yet, thank God, he emerged from it himself, if only for what the weather forecasts call "bright intervals." Whyte happened to be the first to tell me of Stevenson's *Dr. Jekyll.* "The Apostle Paul knew Mr. Hyde," said he darkly, for the story was not to be divulged to me prematurely. "I think he knew Dr. Jekyll too," put in Mrs. Whyte. "Yes, yes, I'm not denying that; but he knew Mr. Hyde." At the very moment of an alarming coach accident—so he wrote in a message to his congregation from his sick room—he had been pondering the words, "Cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground?" What a moment for him! (Whyte did not affect these emotions; he was desperately sincere.) Dante's *Purgatory*—Cary's Dante was one of his great books—was to him a picture of "the life of sanctification." This was perhaps a characteristic one-sidedness; but it contained a truth which our latter-day Puritan enforced with great spiritual results.

Another hero with him was Pascal. His close friend Dods had greeted with somewhat excessive cordiality a translation of Rothe's *Quiet Hours,* comparing it to the *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius and to the *Pensées.* Whyte sent a postcard:

My Dear Dods,
Rothe and Marcus Aurelius!
Rothe and Pascal!!
Rothe and *Tupper.*
Yours ever,
A. W.

This was told me by the late Halliday Douglas, who died, *multis flebilis,* as a young Professor of Theology at Toronto. Dods had shown him the card, saying—plaintively, not querulously—"Do you think that quite fair?"

Perhaps the greatest of all heroes with this confirmed hero-worshipper was John Henry Newman. The legalist or anti-evangelical element in that powerful teacher must have appealed to something in our Puritan. He utterly took away our breath once by telling us that, in his judgment, Newman furnished far the best pattern of great powers of mind reverently submissive to divine truth. "I thought he was going to say Dr. Chalmers!" remarked good old Mr. Benjamin Bell, the surgeon, in my hearing; but his minister had had a very different candidate to push. It was a challenging statement.

One may doubt whether Whyte possessed a system of thought. It seemed hardly possible to co-ordinate in full harmony all the "splendid" ideals that enjoyed his devotion, or to bring together St. Paul and Goodwin and Bunyan and Law and Boehme and Epictetus and Dante and Newman and Browning—but time would fail me to complete the list. St. Paul has been described[1] as

[1] By Ritschl, and again—independently, as it would seem—by Feine.

"dithyrambic," and the phrase gives us one side of the great apostle. Whyte was dithyrambic. "This one thing I do" or "I think" or "I feel"—"this one thing, while I am busy with it"; such might well have been his motto.

So far as Whyte did formulate a system, he was a Manselite. So Dr. Rainy first told me, having learned the fact in conversation. It is not altogether surprising; but surely it is ominous. Dr. Rainy informed me at the same time that old "Rabbi" Duncan—that "philosophical sceptic" as he called himself, "who had taken refuge in theology"—judged differently. When Mansel's Bampton Lectures [1] were the theme of universal debate, "We must all join with Frederick Maurice," said Duncan, "in putting down this new heresy of Mansel's." Now Maurice was in bad odour with the sternly orthodox. R. S. Candlish had been refuting his theology with impatient contempt. Yet Duncan evidently felt that his "refuge" would fail him if he had not in Christ real knowledge of the real God. "Regulative" revelations, or even lists of "What man *is to believe* concerning God"—what are they but *vacant chaff, well meant for grain.*

A friend once said to me, "Walter Smith is a preacher of righteousness." I replied, "That's what I think of Whyte." "No," he rejoined, "Whyte is a preacher of sin." The contrast was genuine enough, but my statement also was true. There were expositions of 1 Peter—"Elect . . . unto obedience"; "Fashioning yourselves"; "A faithful creator"—when the ban of Calvinism lifted, and Whyte, with all his unmatched power, opened up to us the vision of ever-increasing conformity to the will of a loving God. The same friend said to me: "I always think Whyte ought to preach to a congregation of Macbeths and Othellos—men with strong passions and vast possibilities for good or evil." That again was well said; and yet many an obscure sinner or struggling saint has had cause to bless God for Alexander Whyte. "*Homo homini lupus*"; he used to fling the quotation at us, almost—you would have said—gleefully. He would enlarge on our pleasure in hearing evil of those we disliked. How we would take our informant by the arm, and walk him up and down the pavement till we had extracted every drop of the sweet tidings! I suppose he must sometimes have heard the snake-hiss of jealousy or hatred in his own heart. And yet my belief remains fixed that, if anyone ever told Whyte things to the disadvantage of an "enemy," Whyte took the first opportunity of saying something more than usually extreme in generosity regarding the said enemy. Here I may quote a dear friend of our family, the late Miss Isabel Chalmers. She had long been inclined from a distance to criticize Whyte with some severity;

[1] Dr. Whyte's biographer gives interesting details regarding Whyte's enthusiasm for Mansel in college days.

but, after visiting him, she wrote to me that she had found herself "in a true Christian home; they are strict with themselves and generous in their judgment of others."

During one season it was my duty to preside at a Young Men's "Sabbath Morning" Fellowship Association, meeting at 10 a.m. We "numbered good intellects"; I can remember Professor W. R. Sorley's voice in our talks; while the late G. H. C. Macgregor, and John M'Neill the celebrated evangelist, and (I think) Dr. Kelman have told me that they used to be present. Once I had to go through to the Minister's Vestry with a pulpit intimation regarding our proceedings. Whyte was not the preacher, but he was present, and received the notice from me with a brow of thunder. I shrivelled before him. So heavy was the burden of the Lord upon his spirit, even when direct responsibility rested upon another. In the same austere spirit Whyte once rebuked us fiercely for our lively talk as we retired from divine worship; he had happened to be within earshot of his congregation, and had been horror-stricken. Many a lesser preacher can sympathize in that recoil.

Whyte was so busy that his visits, pastoral or friendly, were rare. We saw him at marriages; we saw him, alas! at funerals or in seasons of bereavement. On one such occasion he "made worship" for us, reading the 23rd Psalm. "*He leadeth me in paths of righteousness*—But does He? Does He? Has He been doing it to-day? Have you been letting Him do it?"

There was for me a special charm in the fact that I never felt personal awkwardness in close talk with Whyte—he put himself so frankly, so humanly, so simply alongside one. With others it was different, shyness making me lose touch. When I was associated for a short time with Dr. Walter Smith as missionary-assistant he seemed to me habitually to talk down to my level in the character of a good and wise old man. The vivid, unconventional personality of our poet and satirist was lost to me. Whyte was always Whyte—unaffectedly modest towards the most insignificant of his fellowmen, and walking humbly with God.

He was no debater, but he repeatedly took part in the discussions of the Robertson Smith case, feeling doubtless that he dared not keep silence. I recall the Assembly of 1880. Whyte rose with a shining face, "as it had been the face of an angel," and burst into an expression of longing to leave this Assembly of strife and debate for "the general assembly and church of the first-born in heaven." Loud cries from the opposite party; "Oh! Oh! Oh! Oh!" "You say that he's too young. Sirs, ye're ageing him fast!" ("Oh! Oh! Oh!") I was told afterwards that a supercilious lady critic described the speech as "an exhibition of silliness." Probably there were devout Jewesses who found the dying testimony of the protomartyr a silly thing.

The writer of a letter to the Edinburgh newspapers once appealed to " some Mr. Greatheart like Dr. Whyte " for help in an embittered dispute. It was well said. He was a greatheart truly ; and even that poor impatient being, the man in the street, had made the discovery. Good men, thank God, are not altogether rare, but genuine moral nobility is rare indeed. Its presence in Alexander Whyte crowned all his many-sided greatness. He was great in natural gifts of heart and head—great in his almost incredible systematic diligence—great in his success—great in virtue of that stern self-discipline which he never intermitted—great lastly, as he would wish us to say with the utmost emphasis, if we dared to sum him up or to praise him—great most of all by the grace of God.

Robert Mackintosh.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS

This section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

THE AMERICAN SCENE

SINCE the appearance of the last American letter a Congregationalist has become President of the United States. Calvin Coolidge had long attended one of the Congregational churches in Northampton, Massachusetts, but he had never become a member of the Church. One of the very first of his acts on becoming President of the United States was to become a member of the First Congregational Church in Washington upon confession of his faith. This is the first time in the history of the United States that the Congregational Church in Washington has become the presidential church. Mr. Coolidge is a conservative, silent, cautious individual. Mrs. Coolidge tells with evident amusement that she was a teacher at an Institute for the Deaf and Dumb when Mr. Coolidge met and married her.

The death of Woodrow Wilson ends one of the most spectacular careers of modern times. If one were to try to summarize the thousands of obituary notices which have appeared in the last few weeks, one would arrive at these three statements about his influence:

1. He did his best to bring it about that the great war should have some moral results for the lasting benefit of mankind. So eloquently did he phrase the aims of the Allies as almost to persuade us all for the moment that we occupied the high moral plane of his war messages. The influence of his utterances was of great power in those dark days, as well as a decided factor in the result of the fighting, and it has perhaps some energy left even yet in shaming the world into righteous dealings.

2. He helped on the cause of world organization for peace by striving to bring it into the sphere of practical politics.

3. His failure to carry out his ideals was due largely to a defect in his own temperament which made him incapable of working wisely

with those who disagreed with him, and suspicious of those who would modify his schemes by compromise in any degree.

In general, the times are filled with strange and interesting movements and controversies here, as everywhere. Bishop Lawrence of Massachusetts, who has just celebrated his fiftieth anniversary, has astonished the more conservative element in his Church by publicly asserting that his sympathy is on the side of the modernists within the Church. He stated that, while personally he is inclined to accept the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, yet he does not hold it to be a doctrine which must of necessity be believed by all Christians. The rather astounding liberalism of so influential and respected an authority led to speedy response. The Bishops of the Episcopal Church happened to be meeting in Dallas, Texas, having been convened about an entirely different matter; they took the opportunity of launching a thunderbolt at the head of Bishop Lawrence and of denouncing all modernist views of the ancient doctrines within the Episcopal Church. An immediate alignment took place among the clergy of that Church, many of the most honoured and respected taking their places beside Bishop Lawrence under the flag of liberty. Dr. Leighton Parks, Rector of St. Bartholomew's Church, New York City, and Dr. Elwood Worcester, of Emmanuel Church, Boston, immediately preached sermons which even went so far as to foreshadow the possibility of an open split between the two branches of the Church. The Bishops were evidently surprised by the strength of the opposition to the orthodoxy which they had seemed to deem self-evident. There is much talk through all the Churches of a new alignment of liberals drawn from all communions into a new liberal Church. But liberals do not seem to have the capacity of combining with each other, and there is little probability that there will be any open split in the Episcopal Church.

The Baptist Church at its next convention this summer is to fight on the question whether its entire foreign missionary enterprise is to pass into the hands of the fundamentalists, who represent the extreme orthodox party of the Church. Everywhere the fundamentalist ministers are urging the liberals, if they are sincere, to get out of the Church and to go into the Unitarian fold, "where they really belong." The liberals retort that the fundamentalists should get out of the Protestant Church and seek their home in Roman Catholicism, under the ægis of whose absolute authority *they* really belong.

In the Presbyterian Church Dr. Henry Van Dyke, formerly Moderator of the Church and known everywhere as author and poet, has given up his pew in the church in Princeton because of the ministrations of Professor Machen, one of the leading scholars among the fundamentalists. Dr. Van Dyke asserted that the "schismatic and unspiritual preaching" he heard had spoilt his Sundays, and that he did not wish to waste his time "in listening to such dismal,

bilious travesty of the Gospel. We want to hear about Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man, not about the fundamentalists and modernists, the only subject on which your stated supply seems to have anything to say, and on which most of what he says is untrue and malicious." The committee which was appointed by the Presbytery to investigate the teaching of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick at the First Presbyterian Church, New York, reported that his preaching conformed to Church doctrines. Dr. Fosdick stated in a letter incorporated in the report: "I am in the ministry of the Evangelical Churches because I belong there and nowhere else—reared in Evangelical Christianity, confirmed in it, convinced of it, and ready to live and die for it. The liberty I claim, to think through the Gospel in terms really cogent in our own time, is, I am sure, not a denial of the Gospel, but one of the most precious and sacred privileges and responsibilities, which our Evangelical forefathers claimed for themselves, fought for, and gloriously used."

The Congregationalists are not much disturbed by heresy controversies. It will be remembered that when Br'er Fox threatened to throw Br'er Rabbit into a briar patch, Br'er Rabbit laughed and said: "Born and bred in a briar patch, Br'er Fox! Born and bred in a briar patch!" The atmosphere of the free and lively discussion of religious dogma is the briar patch in which we Congregationalists have been born and bred.

Another interesting sign of the times is the new atmosphere of the Student Volunteer Movement shown in the convention held lately in Indianapolis. Nearly a thousand colleges were represented by the seven thousand college student delegates present. Set speeches by adult Christian leaders on safe and sane orthodox subjects, arranged to lead up to an emotional revivalistic climax associated with the signing of pledge cards of some nature—this used to be the atmosphere of such conventions, but the young men took the bit between their teeth this time and stampeded their leaders—some of whom were by no means unwilling—into a facing of awkward, modern social and international problems. In the end it was found that the young men were not as radical as had been feared. It appeared by vote that six thousand of the more than seventy-five hundred delegates favoured efforts to prevent war by international co-operation. About five hundred delegates voted for an attitude of refusal to participate in any way in any future war. Only one hundred and fifty were of the view that energetic preparations for war are the best way to avoid war. The other questions in which the delegates themselves were most interested were the questions of inter-racial relations and standards of industry, and independent meetings were held outside the regular conference by those who wished to have their views represented, but could not get upon the platform of the conference owing

to the conservatism of the business committee. Even upon the most conservative adults in charge of the conference some idea seemed to dawn of the humour of continuing to imagine that America appears to the rest of the world as a " Christian nation," and a little question as to the wisdom of treating the United States as a home base for recruiting and financing only. The young men definitely asserted that it was part of the Churches' duty to make the so-called " Christian lands " a little more Christ-like.

The mystic letters K.K.K. are to be found in every newspaper in the United States these days. It is a strange movement, supposedly on behalf of 100 per cent. Americanism, and it is directed against any " unAmerican " race or institution of which the people in any particular neighbourhood happen to be afraid. In the South the white people are in many places afraid of the negroes, and the Ku Klux Klan becomes anti-negro and in favour of a white America. In many parts of the middle west the Roman Catholic Church has just come to the point where its power is beginning to be appreciated by the old-timers, and there the K.K.K. is anti-Catholic. Often the clergy of the Protestant Churches and the most reputable citizens are members of this secret organization. It has much that is good in its ideals, as it attempts to conserve some of the best traditions of the nation. Its weak point is the secrecy, which is associated with the masks worn by its members, and a certain commercialism which is inherent in its method of organization. Its strength largely depends upon the fear that the average Protestant citizen has of the secret methods, say, of the Roman Catholic Church. They believe that the truth about the Catholic Church cannot be published in the papers. They believe that it is plotting against the public school system of the United States, and that it is a great secret organization directed against American institutions. The only cure for movements like the K.K.K. which appeal to the old-fashioned Puritanism of the average American, and also to his love for grandiloquent and bombastic titles and mystery, is *publicity* as to the aims and methods of such institutions as the Roman Catholic Church. If, by the light of public knowledge, strange fears as to the power of Rome in the United States can be dispelled, K.K.K. would probably lose most of its present power.

The interest in prohibition continues unabated. Many magazines are offering large prizes for the best discussion of the whole situation. One of them publishes the results of twenty-two thousand letters which it has received in answer to the question : " What do you think of prohibition ? " and summarizes the results in some such statements as these : That if you have the price and know the ropes you can " get it " almost anywhere. The drier the locality the more likely you are to die or go blind as a result of drinking what you do get. Yet nobody wants the saloon back again. Public drunkenness

has decreased everywhere, except perhaps in the coal-mining fields. Private social drinking of a faddish kind is common in cities among the well-to-do. There is an impression that the federal enforcement officers are generally bribed. It is generally held that either hard liquor or the automobile has to go—the drunken man or woman at the wheel of a fast car is recognized to be so great a menace. Savings Bank deposits, ownership of homes, and other evidences of thrift have increased everywhere during the prohibition years. The general feeling is increasing that the courts must enforce the present law, but that Congress should remove offensive, irritating, and non-enforceable provisions from the Volstead Act.

One of the citizens of Massachusetts has been deeply interested in the fact that there was no word to describe in scathing and contemptible enough terms that citizen who broke the prohibition laws and continued to drink in a lawless manner. A prize has been therefore offered for the best word which would describe such a poor citizen with the same opprobrious flavour as does the word "slacker" in time of war and the word "scab" in the trade union movement. The prize has just been awarded to the word "scofflaw," which will now be introduced by the friends of prohibition as one method of driving home to the average drinking citizen that he is a poor sport and a bad example to the young.[1]

Great interest has been aroused in the Bok prize award on the League of Nations controversy. That whole matter has most unfortunately become so involved in domestic politics in the United States that it is hard to extricate it. If you did not like Wilson's personality you are irrevocably opposed to any type of a League of Nations. There is no such thing as any general public opinion on the question. In the Churches one finds the deepest desire to know how best to help in the international situation, but little light on the question as to how it can be done.

The plan which has won the Bok prize amounts briefly to this: That the United States shall immediately enter the World Court under the conditions outlined by President Harding in February, 1923, and that, without becoming a member of the League of Nations, the United States shall offer to extend its present co-operation with the League and participate in its work *as a body of mutual counsel* under conditions which substitute moral force and public opinion for the military and economic force originally implied in Articles X and XVI; safeguard the Monroe Doctrine; assume no obligations under the Treaty of Versailles except by act of Congress; propose that membership in the League shall be open to all nations; and provide for the continuing development of international law. The discussion of this well-advertised Bok competition is having a great educational effect everywhere here.

[1] Later. The friends of "Liberty" are now offering prizes for a word to describe "old maids who want to look after other people's business."

The National Council of Congregational Churches was held at Springfield, Massachusetts, in October last. Dr. W. E. Barton, moderator, dwelt especially upon the failure of the Concordat, an attempt by prominent Episcopal and Congregational clergymen to bring about a mutual recognition of Orders. Dr. Barton said: "The road that lies in that direction is plainly marked 'No Thoroughfare.' The sooner that Episcopalians and Congregationalists understand each other the better. Congregationalists admit no defect in their Orders. . . . Congregationalist Churches gladly acknowledge the validity of the ministry of the Episcopal Church, but they do not acknowledge any measure of superiority above their own. Congregationalists claim for their own ministry all that they can ever admit of validity or spiritual efficacy in any ministry."

The meetings of the National Council, as usual, were of high inspirational value, and adopted many safe and sane resolutions on matters concerning the general welfare of the Kingdom.

J. Edgar Park.

THE CONGREGATIONAL COUNTRY CHURCH

I

"Ugliness is blasphemy."—*Quinnie.*

"The Ugliness of Protestantism has been Rome's opportunity."—*Dr. Percy Dearmer.*

"Whatsoever things are lovely—think on these things."—*St. Paul.*

The problems urgently awaiting solution in many of our small village Congregational Churches are numerous and peculiar, and call for a survey of their causes and for the adoption of a wise progressive policy. Unfortunately there are few denominations in which change of any sort is so distrusted or old-fashioned conservatism so deeply entrenched. There are many reasons for this distrust of change with which we older folk will quite naturally agree, but the dominant reason is usually attributable to the lack of wise leading and ministerial oversight, and also to the arbitrary and uninformed control exercised by lay preachers, who, notwithstanding their generous self-sacrifice and the useful work which they contribute, are often out of touch with the evolution of religious thought and expression, and swayed by a deep-rooted mistrust of every attempt to improve matters. Sometimes they have little sympathy with the attitude of many of our young people towards a more devotional and reverent order of worship. There are, of course, many notable exceptions. Often our members are so obsessed by their reading of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* that even the singing of the "Amens" or the chanting of the Lord's Prayer brings on such tremors of apprehension as almost to destroy their just

balance of discernment. To them the smallest attempt at a more intelligent and congregational form of worship is a step Romewards.

And yet opportunities for the greater usefulness of the smaller Churches are rapidly increasing, for villages which were once remote are no longer inaccessible. The motor-bus has altered all that, with the result that large numbers of Congregational families (members perhaps of our more progressive town Churches) are moving into the country. Even before the invasion of the motor-bus I remember the late Dr. Goodrich telling me that on a previous Sunday he had no less than six of his former deacons in his congregation at a country church.

The loss of such people by our town Churches might be contemplated with a certain degree of composure if our village Churches were attracting them. It is quite evident that they do not succeed in doing this, and under present conditions it is almost unreasonable to expect it. It is not that they (the town Congregationalists) object to lay preachers so much as to the general atmosphere of mawkish sentimentality and commonplaceness, not to say slovenliness, which characterizes the village church and its services. The church and its appointments, its music and pulpit utterance, offend their sense of propriety and make worship wellnigh impossible.

The times are ripe for reaping new harvests of effective service. Indeed, it is probably true that the opportunities which lie ahead of our village Churches were never more promising. What is needed is an architectural setting and a new conception of devotional worship and the courage to apply it.

The improvements which are suggested for the settlement of our most urgent problems may be included under four main headings :

(1) Reorganization of Church management for the purpose of securing the objects under the other three headings. Little can be achieved without vigorous and proper control and direction. These are essential for :
(2) The erection of a new church, or the improvement of existing premises by the elimination of all questionable internal and external decorations, and by reasonable provision of comfort for the congregation.
(3) Better church music, instrumental and vocal, and the introduction of simple choral liturgies.
(4) The substitution of lay readers for lay preachers.

Problem 1.—The organization could include a progress and propaganda Committee, which should contain a proportion of active young members. Where there is a diaconate or Church trustees, the recommendations of the Committee should be finally approved by them, but the initiative should be vested in the new Committee,

and—having secured approval—executive power should be exercised by it. Needless to add, much would depend upon a wise choice of chairman or leader of the Committee.

Problem 2.—One of my first recollections of Nonconformity was of the great indignation which swept through the country when the late Lord Salisbury refused a site for a Nonconformist church in Hatfield. This incident influenced the next General Election, and had much to do in arousing the Nonconformist conscience. I shared in the indignation and thought that Lord Salisbury must be a very wicked man. As a town planner, anxious for the preservation of local character in our villages, I now wish there had been more men like him, anxious to preserve the traditional charm of our English villages, even though their action might in some cases have led to the curtailment of the ambitions of local Nonconformity. I have, however, more admiration for men like the late Lord Battersea, who gave a site for a village church at Overstrand on condition that he might be allowed to select the architect and pay his fees. Better still is the method of Lord Leverhulme, who built a Congregational church as the central note in the village of Thornton Hough in Cheshire.

The design and architectural character of our village churches is most important, and when one realizes how much cheaper it is to build well than it is to build ill, one is amazed to find how seldom we reach any degree of simple expressive dignity. In a beautiful village church we naturally take off our hats ; in those *we* usually build no one thinks it irreverent to remain with head covered.

I have often inquired into the origin of modern examples of village churches of peculiarly blatant ugliness, which so often do so much to destroy one's pleasure in an otherwise beautiful village. The result of my inquiries invariably brings the same answer: the congregation was too poor to employ an architect, and so Mr. Jones, the builder, offered to do the plans for nothing. Of course, Mr. Jones was asked to build the church, and, of course, he spent fifty per cent. more than an architect would have spent—but what a difference between what is, and what might have been. In one case a blot has been perpetrated ; in the other a charming architectural note might have been added to the village.

There is absolutely no excuse for the appalling incompetence which seems to direct and control the design of our Nonconformist village churches. There is, on the contrary, every reason why they should be attractive, of comely proportion, and beautiful in their simplicity. The most alarming fact is that the more highly educated and responsible younger Congregationalists are finding this neglect of beauty and order intolerable, and are constantly adding to the ranks of the Anglican Churches. Many people say that it is the social pull which is responsible for this depletion, but if one con-

siders the matter, it will at once be seen that if Congregational families had retained their allegiance, village Congregational Churches might have been vigorous social centres. It would in many cases be correct to say they leave us because they cannot tolerate ugliness.

In what particular respects do our small village churches fail to attain to a reasonable artistic expression of Nonconformist architecture ?

(1) They are often so placed as to lose that advantage which may accrue from proper correlation with the plan of the village and from happy association with surroundings. They are often remote from the population, and in some cases outside the village.

(2) They are usually too large for the needs of the congregation, and are therefore more than half empty, excepting at Harvest Thanksgiving and other very special occasions.

(3) In so far as they have any pretentions to style, our churches are examples of the most debased Carpenter or Batty Langly Gothic.

(4) They seldom follow any local tradition externally, flaming red brick being often used in a stone-built village, or yellow brick in a village famed for its buildings of hand-made red bricks. Internally the effect is often tawdry and pretentious to a degree. Varnished, pitchpine pews and woodwork, also rudely varnished, or woodwork grained and varnished to look like oak, are common. Windows are filled in with cheap coloured glass and sometimes mere transfer paper imitations of coloured glass, and with this are walls coloured chocolate, blue and cream, stencilled with some other colour.

(5) Many of these churches are disfigured with inconvenient and unnecessary galleries, which cost more to construct than the same accommodation would have cost on the ground floor.

Simplicity in design, plan and arrangement, along with sound proportions and good workmanship, are the artistic qualities most desirable. Whatever the style adopted, it should unmistakably express the purpose of churches as " meeting-places " for public worship. This purpose is defeated by the use of terra-cotta or any other exotic material, the general effect of which is to destroy the restfulness of the church. It should never be forgotten that whilst a congregation of fifty in a church seated for one hundred may be quite inspiring, the same congregation in a church seated for two hundred and fifty may have a very opposite effect on both preacher and congregation.

Now, these architectural qualities of which I have spoken can

only be realized by an architect, and the object is so worthy and so full of possibilities that our most capable men would participate, notwithstanding the fact that in the case of such small work they would, on the usual charge of six per cent., sustain a loss. Their reward would consist in the satisfaction of realizing opportunities which have hitherto been missed.

In the case of our existing village churches it is often difficult to persuade a congregation to exchange the church in which their most sacred associations have been cast for admittedly more beautiful buildings. With this attitude I have great sympathy, and if the church can be remodelled in such a manner as to obliterate its most glaring faults whilst retaining its associations, the effort should be made. There are fortunately many cases in which, under skilled advice, this has been done with admirable results.

Problem 3.—Every village Church, however small, can, if given the right encouragement, raise a good choir, and generally an enthusiastic choirmaster, but they cannot be held together on Sankey's hymns or a very old Congregational Hymnal, accompanied by a weasy old harmonium, badly played. What is needed is a good instrument and a thoroughly good hymnal—and the latter Congregationalism possesses. What is even more important is to create reverent congregational worship, and this is best attained by the adoption of a simple liturgy set to simple music in which everyone can join—such, for instance, as that adopted for the small church at Caton, near Lancaster. This arrangement gives the choir the opportunity of realizing its function, viz. that of leading the congregation in their prayer and praise. The choir feel they are serving their Church, and the congregation are helped.

Problem 4.—On the principle that a good print of a masterpiece is preferable to a bad painting by an amateur, so I think that really capable readers of short discourses by our best men would be greatly preferred to long discourses which have been going the round of our village churches as long as one can remember, and which, for the most part, are out of touch with present day religious experience. Many of our lay preachers are splendid readers—why not use their best talents in this way? I can imagine very attractive Church posters advertising: "The Old Gospel Applied to Present Day Needs," by J. H. Jowett; "The Gospel of Faith and Hope," by J. A. Hutton; "The True Catholic Religion," by W. E. Orchard; or "Prodigals and the Way Home," by Herbert Gamble—say a month's sermons by each. Not having the ability to preach a sermon myself, I have often read one of Dr. Jowett's meditations from *The British Weekly*, and always with acceptance. There is no plagiarism in this, and the congregation realize that they are listening to the appeal of a really great man.

Thus with a more simple dignity in the design of our village

churches; a scale of seating accommodation sulted to the weekly congregations; a really live Church organization; better music and a form of prayer and praise in which the congregation can take a part; the appointment of lay readers where good pulpit supplies are difficult to obtain; reverent care for the fabric and the attention of the Committee to the regular supply of flowers for the table and attention to the reasonable comfort of the congregation—much could be done to create a worshipful atmosphere in the church.

Having done this we should have succeeded in endearing the village church to those who worship in it, and we should train our people in reverence. Why should we village Congregationalists be less reverent in our own places of worship than we are on the occasions when we attend the Anglican Church? Surely we do not regard our own Churches as secular institutions and the Anglican Churches only as sacred?

Finally, I have often been surprised that we do not more often utilize our retired ministers for the oversight of our small village Churches. Think what it would mean to many men who, whilst unable to continue their work in the towns, could be given a small manse and say £50 a year for oversight of the Church, visitations, monthly Communion, occasional baptisms, marriages and burials, and for sermons as often as they felt inclined—say two sermons monthly, with selected lay preachers or readers for the remainder. Such an arrangement could be realized in many villages with advantage to pastor and people. I think that in many old-world villages a quaint cottage could be bought for a few hundred pounds, but even if a manse had to be built, it could be brought within the subsidy and probably erected for about £600, especially if in close relationship with the church, so that the vestry could be used as a pastor's study.

If we fail to use our aged ministers, we also fail to use the vacation of the senior students of our colleges. Many village Churches would take on a new lease of usefulness if presided over for three months by a well-read student, and what a useful experience for the student. The fact that village congregations prefer twenty minutes' sermons would ease the pulpit work of both aged pastor or potential orator.

I would like to suggest that a small part of the results of the Forward Movement should be allocated to the furtherance of this practical application of retiring benefits and for the help of the aspirants to the ministry. THOMAS H. MAWSON.

II

It is easy, when reading the trenchant articles of our Chairman-elect, or while listening to his eloquence, to be so carried away by the sweep of the tide as almost to miss some point or other which

deserves more permanent consideration. In the CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY for April 1923 an item of this description appeared, and lest, by its position in an altogether interesting article, it should lose any of its emphasis, I beg leave to quote it. Let me remark in passing that I have since heard it from the speaker's lips in such fashion as to be remembered, not only for the cogency of its argument, the force of its phrasing, and the passion of its delivery, but because it also so truly publishes the actual experience of some Churches and many ministers who feel they are "taking their gruel." This is the quotation:

"If, in the best and healthiest sense, our denomination is to discharge its full evangelistic responsibility, it must put itself to the test in places which, for a variety of reasons, are difficult. When every allowance is made for grades of gifts and personality, the fact remains that some churches are almost as hard to empty as others are to fill. A congregation of fifty in one district is the moral equivalent of five hundred in another. In some places the intellectual atmosphere is so stagnant, the environment so destitute of stimulus, that three years there implies as much staying power as thirty years somewhere else. Of course it is a minister's pledge and call to keep keen and fresh and on mental tiptoe, wherever he is placed. I am only saying that the challenge is immensely harder to meet in some places than in others."

It would not be difficult to suggest phrases where italics would bring this quotation into immediate relation with the title of this article. Places, districts, and provinces have no doubt their characteristic difficulties, varying with climatic and industrial conditions. And these area differences have as much effect on the work of the Churches as the grades of gift and personality. So that even if we assume the rank and file of the brethren to be reducible to a definite average standard, the fact will remain that our rural Churches are greatly affected by an area mentality which makes for the differences which the above quotation asserts do exist. In a village or small town the drabness of everyday life, with no variety year in, year out, is enough to account for the stagnant atmosphere. The petty and inescapable environment offers nothing to make up the deficiency of stimulus, but rather causes it, while the intimate associations and more than complete knowledge of everyone's affairs preclude any outstanding leadership. And where, as is more often the case, education rarely rises above elementary standards, the lack of even a faint, far glimpse of intellectualism or superior culture is certain to prohibit all hope of modernist progress, and dim any vision of bigger and wider things. Under such conditions it seems almost vain to look for vigorous enterprise.

Lacking largely, through a natural rustic slowness, the faculty

of sharpening wit against wit, except in a crude way, and unable through that first retarding barrier—insufficient education—to appreciate the nice distinctions of thought which are current coin amongst others more favoured, many people in country places are compelled to remain in that rut of which we so often hear complaint. What excitement their being craves (the psychology of which they could not analyse or explain) they must create for themselves, unless some benevolent squire, or the lucky visit of some chance showman on rare occasions, makes good these deficiencies. Thus we find that in some districts where fruit is grown for cider, cider becomes the distraction, with, it is said, its ultimate depression of mental vigour (especially marked among the children). In another district—is it Lincolnshire?—the natural barrenness of feature in the country-side leads, so a psychologist affirms, to variegated waistcoats! It is more common knowledge that in many mining districts recreation assumes no more intelligent form than whippet racing.

Our point is that all this dead level of existence is bound to react on our Churches and tend towards inefficiency. It is hardly surprising that this same dull monotony is carried bodily by the people into their religious life, making it as humdrum as the rest. They do not mean to do so, and are probably unconscious of the fact, for the very reason that the Church has simply taken its place as one of their limited interests. The danger is that attendance at divine worship, even when regularly maintained, is apt to become as much a matter of form and custom as the same habit so much deplored formerly among a "degenerate aristocracy." Further, is there not something in the fact that, as our fathers understood very little of the value of the artistic as an aid to reverence and as giving impulse to inspiring thought, the barn-like sanctuaries which disfigure so many rural spots are very little help towards things ever being any different? Also in some places, the type and tone and general level of the services undoubtedly leave room for improvement. It is plain that the total effect, while on the whole elevating and instructive past all expectation, is hardly calculated to bring about that ardour and spiritual passion which are the appeal of our Forward Movement. It is a wonder, taking all things into account, that we get our "fifty."

In the case of some smaller towns one often finds the same conditions, though the effect may result from somewhat different causes. For example, the writer has in mind a town of 5,600 population. To gauge the mentality of the people one has to explain why their genius runs to multiplicity of organizations. Their fecundity in this direction is a perennial source of wonder at their faith and admiration for their optimism. Societies of one sort or another are born almost weekly, and even if some die

n infancy and others are still-born, the good work goes on, the same ourageous souls sustain an implicit faith that the salvation of the own's life abides in their creating some new thing—for a public vhich in the long run will patronize nothing but the "movies." The pity of it is that these same good folk are those who—did they ot dissipate their energies by prodigal extravagance of this sort—ould, by putting their shoulder to *our* wheel, get a move on our Churches, and give a fillip in directions which are likely to have more permanent and beneficent effect on the public

But the same disastrous fertility appears also in the religious ife of the town, for what can explain, with the population men-ioned, the existence of eleven places of worship, with nine resident ninisters—this in consideration of the fact, too, that only a quarter r a third of the population attends any church at all? Further, o this must be added a keen competitive business life, with, enerally speaking, no wider outlook or higher principle than monetary rofit, a low moral standard, an almost entire absence of high thical ideal, no culture worth mentioning, and an appalling lack f interest in books.

The salt of the earth is in the Churches, but one stands amazed hat the Churches are not more moribund than they are.

All these things have their effect on the minister. It is inevitable, o matter how consecrated he may be. It is often said that environ-nent moulds character, that circumstances shape destiny. We preach ifferently; but let a man remain in a place such as has been escribed beyond Mr. Pringle's allotted span of three years, and he ends to overhaul his philosophy very drastically. Consider his ase. It is true he goes to such a sphere, is called there, is not ompelled to go. But he is young and eager, fresh from college erhaps, and conjures up rosy dreams of altering all that. He egins on this flush of enthusiasm. His ordination gives an initial purt to things in general. He soon begins to wonder why the eople do not come to hear him. In a little more time, say a couple f years, when he grows aware that the subtle enervation of the lace is sapping his own soul, he almost wonders why any of them o come at all. He is usually facing the traditional hold of the Established Church. He is eternally confronting the stone wall of ndifference and the miry ditch of crass ignorance. Thrown into ne intimate associations unavoidable in small places, he and his ife are fortunate and exceptional if they are not the target for ttle-tattle gossip. He is practically shorn of intellectual society ave that of the heresy-hunter: there are no good lectures within easonable distance, and the Fraternal remains, in his isolation, ne dream it was in college days. Cut off from facilities for debate nd discussion on things which interest him most, his only resource his library. Along with his wife he must endeavour to keep

his Church in touch with Heaven, while he has all his work cut out to keep his own soul alive Lacking association with his brethren, except rare County Union Meetings, or a still more rare May Meeting, he is supposed to work up some enthusiasm for "fellowship." If I can shrewdly guess anything of a Moderator's life while these conditions obtain among his *protégés*, he has my pity Without saying that the last state is worse than the first, I do feel sure that the larger proportion of our Moderators' worries is due to the conditions under which the men who worry them pass their days. For no average minister, at least a young man with any ambition and with the vital years of his career slipping away, can be expected to keep on thus indefinitely.

This article is intended not to offer solutions, but merely to state a problem. The writer feels he is expressing facts that oppress not a few, and sets out these lines as reflections on things seen during active ministry. Remedies may perhaps be suggested by others who have faced these things. Perhaps a genius will arise to initiate a Forward Movement which can eliminate distances, remove that dread shadow of isolation, and incidentally endow Secondary Schools and other ameliorative advantages which will make for a brighter country-side. If so, these lines will have achieved their purpose. W. Haddon Beer.

AN EXPERIMENT IN SOCIAL SERVICE [1]

The Northampton which recently welcomed the Autumnal Meeting of our Union with such lavish generosity was a very different place from the Northampton I first visited in the hard winter of 1888. I can never forget that visit. The staple industry of the town had

[1] This extract from history is printed to illustrate what might be done in the way of applying Christian ideals to industry. The writer will shortly complete fifty years public and ministerial service in the City of London. How Northampton itself regarded Mr. Williams's intervention may be gathered from a speech of Alderman Manfield, the President of the Manufacturers' Association, made some time afterwards in London when Mr. Williams was being congratulated on his election as an Alderman of the London County Council:

". . . I come here to-day as a messenger not only from the manufacturers, whom I have the honour to represent, but also from the work-people, and I do not know that I could give a greater testimony than I bring to-day to the excellence of Mr. Williams' services. Some allusion has been made, Sir, to trade questions and to arbitration. I will not attempt, Sir, to go into this matter, but I may say that some eighteen months ago in Northampton we had really a terrible struggle and a very trying time. It is not to my purpose to harrow up the feelings of this audience by saying what misery we had suffered. . . . I will not attempt to justify the masters. I will not attempt to justify the men. Subsequent events have revealed that we both wished what was right and just. While we were in the depths of our struggle and in the depths of our misery, with little hope of a settlement, Mr. Williams appeared on the scene as a ministering angel, as a messenger of peace. By his judicious management he brought us together. We healed our differences, we settled our 'statement,' we established an Arbitration Board, and since that time we have had peace and goodwill on both sides."—Ed.

een brought to a dead standstill by a "lock-out" which had been naintained through many long, dreary, disastrous weeks. The lushy streets were filled with aimless loungers, eddying here and here into morose and angry groups. Most of the shops were huttered, with notices posted up announcing the inability of their roprietors to give further credit, and in the destitute homes of the vorkers' wives and mothers were putting up an incredibly courageous ght against hunger and disease. The struggle of that desolate vinter was a terrible one, plunging not only the parties to it but the vhole community into the depths of misery.

Many attempts had been made by well-meaning people to bring bout a reconciliation between employers and employed, but without uccess, due to a mistake in their diagnosis of the cause of the trouble. There was undoubtedly a great deal of bitterness and obstinate nisunderstanding on both sides, but that was not the effective ause of the irreconcilability of the parties: it inflamed the situa- ion, it did not explain it. The fact was that men and masters were he victims of an inherent economic vice in the basic principle on vhich their common business was built up. It was an industrial ersion of the famous story of the Kilkenny Cats—the mischievous knot tied in their tails, it will be remembered, led to misunder- tandings which ultimately resulted in nothing being left of the wo violent combatants but the knot—a tragic parable which all vould-be social reformers should lay to heart. It was the knot *vhich they did not tie* that rendered inevitable and intelligible their trained relations and their irrational and ferocious treatment of ach other. It was so at Northampton, as it is still in the vast najority of those costly disputes which are the shame and almost lespair of the industrial world to-day.

The manufacturers' case was that in the conditions under which hey carried on their trade they had no option but to close down heir factories. Competition between themselves and their foreign ivals had resulted in gravely reducing the demand for the goods hey produced, not only in the home market but in the markets verseas. They could see only one way of meeting that competition, he old way, the way which time and again had enabled them to eep their precarious foothold in home and colonial markets; they *nust*, they had no choice, effect further economies in production. That proved to be difficult: machinery, leather, linen, and all the ndispensable requirements of their business cost each manufacturer he same amount, with negligible variations in small discounts; he only element in production, therefore, on which a further savings n costs might be effected was WAGES. Wages had already been orced down to a risky minimum, and it was regrettable that it had ecome necessary to attempt further reductions. Many employers ssured me of their sympathy with their harassed work-people, but

they added, the stern necessities of business permitted no indulgence in sentimental regrets.

The wage-earners resisted the proposed reduction, and pleaded that wages were already down to the lowest endurable minimum, and that it was impossible for them to accept further reductions without such a lowering of their standard of life as would render existence intolerable for them and their dependents. Hence the "lock-out" and all the moral and material consequences which both sides deplored but could see no way of preventing.

It was when the conflict had reached its bitterest, because most hopeless, stage, that the representatives of the Men's Union invited me down to talk matters over with them—I had had some experiences which they thought might prove useful. I spent an anxious week in conferences alternatively with the men and their employers. I found it no easy matter to secure a hearing by the Employers' Association. Our discussions often lasted far into the early hours of the morning, but we did at last get down to the root cause of the difficulty. We became substantially unanimous in the view that there was one solution of the problem, admittedly difficult, probably impracticable, certainly revolutionary, which should have a trial. My constant reply to the fears of the timid was, "Try it. You can only fail, and at the worst find yourselves in no uglier plight than you are to-day."

If we could reverse the basic principle on which the business was conducted; if we could, that is, transfer competition from *cheapness* to *excellence* of production, many hopeful possibilities come into view. We should at least go far towards putting an end to the wretched necessity for sweating wages down in the interest of cheapness of production. The automatic tendency of low wages to generate scamped and inferior workmanship would certainly be arrested, and a hope was born that with the aid of better modern machinery, more scientifically equipped management, and higher skilled labour, the crushing competition of France, Switzerland, and America might be met on more equal terms. If the business could be placed on a basis rendering it possible for *ability* to reap and enjoy its appropriate rewards, the industry, as a whole, would be saved from the incompetence, discontent, and trickery which were its bane and might well become its ruin. The proposal to found the business on a group of new and finer motives was attractive enough as a theory. By what administrative machinery could it be harnessed to the practical necessities of the counting office and the bench? The machinery was created, but I can do no more than baldly outline its nature:

1. A schedule was prepared of the wages which every manufacturer would be compelled to pay for the labour he employed. That schedule was based on a detailed analysis of the many processes

rough which a boot or shoe passes on its way to completion. The bject of this "Statement" was to secure the worker an agreed inimum wage, which would be protected against disturbance by ie united resources of the Employers' Association and the Workers' nion.

2. The appointment of a "Board of Conciliation," composed of qual proportions of workmen and employers, the Board to appoint s own chairman. All disputes arising in the trade, from whatever ause, it was agreed should be submitted to the Board and its arbitra- ient accepted as final. (Provision was made for a Court of Final ppeal should the Board fail to agree: but as no necessity for the ummoning of such court has arisen it is unnecessary to enter into ie carefully considered details of its constitution.)

The agreement, which formally embodied the details of the settle- ient, was solemnly signed by selected representatives of the lanufacturers' Association and the Men's Union on Christmas ve, 1888. The Christmas bells were ringing when I left the crowded all—Hall of Commerce, I think they called it—to catch a train ack to London, to "preach" next morning to my patient and olerant people.

That was thirty-five years ago. How has the experiment worked? he settlement arrived at has never been disturbed; the basic rinciple of the boot and shoe trade of Northampton is to-day that dopted then; the "Statement" has been revised from time to me, but always and only to raise the minimum wage of the workers; *ere has never been a single strike or lock-out during all those years.* here have been times of stress, occasionally severe stress, but ways the absolute confidence in the wisdom and impartial justice f the "Board of Conciliation" felt by manufacturers and men ike has preserved not peace only, but something even more precious, utual confidence and cordial good-will. All the results hoped for the nature of trade development have been more than realized. orthampton has no reason to fear competition, come from where may. She has no successful rival in the open markets of the orld. The footwear she produces, for comfort, style, finish, and urability, has won for her the distinction of being the metropolis f one of the most trusted, honoured, and prosperous industries of ie British Empire. But from my standpoint, the best of all is iat the trade is no longer rent and distracted by those discontents, isunderstandings, and bitternesses which once prevailed. The old ause of the trouble removed, the men have the chance to live in eir worthiest manhood, and not, compulsorily, in that lower version f it which turns them into harsh slave-drivers or discontented, oured, resentful, and reluctant "hands," slaves of the machine which they find themselves entangled. Whilst at Northampton st October it was exhilarating to hear from the secretary of the

Men's Union that nothing could exceed the warm, genuine friendliness of the relations between his Union and the Employers' Federation.

That is the story, and I have told it for a special purpose; I commend it earnestly to the attention of the men upon whom rests the responsibility of either allowing the Social Service Committee of our great Union to die out, as seems at the moment its likeliest fate, or of resuscitating and adequately equipping it for a more worthy future of aggressive usefulness. The Committee might, and should, be composed of men sufficiently informed and wisely discreet, courageous, and above all unequivocably committed to the social ideas of Jesus. He *did* idealize humanity and would never allow the disappointing actual to strangle His faith in what He held as the possible. As it appears to me, His whole life and death was a sustained and consistent protest against the soulless and soul-withering speculation that the world, this world, our world of actions and relationships, was incapable of becoming inspired by the quality of motives which make heaven what it is—the beautiful result of God's achieved supremacy. I have been deeply moved by young Armstrong Hunter's bewildered outcry in the *Forum*, and no sentence in that frank self-disclosure has stung me more than that in which he contrasts the ideal of social progress which has fired his imagination with what he has found to be the attitude of all the ministers he knows on social regeneration. He is saying out what he knows is felt by others: "Our hearts grow cold and our minds numb when we realize that not one preacher in this country has a clearly defined platform that appeals to us, on which the needs of employees, employers, and consumers can be reconciled."

I hope he and others will discover that that is not the whole truth. If it were, it would go far to explain a good many things, and amongst them why strong, ardent, young souls are not crowding into the Christian ministry.

C. Fleming Williams.

G.A.

Someone has threatened to start a Society for the Suppression of Superfluous Societies, and probably its formation would be hailed with delight by many weary Church workers. These disillusioned folks will greet with annoyance the mention of any other organization new to them, and they are advised to turn to another page.

But there are many young people not yet disillusioned (but full of hopes) and not afraid to give their allegiance to an organization if it promises to embody their ideals and give scope for their energies. To them this article is addressed.

The G.A.—or, to give it its full title, the Girls' Auxiliary of the

ondon Missionary Society—like its sister organizations in other enominations, was formed " to unite the girls of our Churches in fellowship of study, prayer and service for the Kingdom of God." lthough officially an Auxiliary of the L.M.S., its horizon is by no eans confined to the fields of that Society's work. Its members e following with eager interest the fortunes of the Christian ruggle at home as well as abroad ; they are trying to understand me of the forces ranged against the Church in the modern world ; ey are searching for themselves at the sources of Christian faith d power ; and they have adopted as their motto " The Service Youth for the Kingdom of God."

If you call at the house of a G.A. member on Study Circle night the winter, you will find a group of girls round the fire discussing homas à Kempis—or perhaps T. R. Glover. If you make a tour the Church premises, you may surprise a group in the deacons' estry, stitching away at hospital necessaries while a missionary iography is being read aloud ; or you may come upon them in a abby schoolroom sitting in painful rows listening to a lecture on e present outlook in India ; or perhaps you will find them in e four corners of the Church parlour having a group discussion n the relative merits of the ideals of Marcus Garvey and Booker Vashington.

Of the G.A. prayer life it is not easy to speak, but a few words ay indicate the spirit of it. Apart from the time given to inter- ession at every branch meeting, many branches have their regular rayer meetings, and are discovering the value of ordered and uided corporate prayer, and are learning not to fear silence, on e one hand, nor the sound of their own voices, on the other.

The G.A. carries out the third part of its aim—service—through s study and its prayer, and also through all the work done indi- idually by its members in the Church or outside it. But beyond ese there are some forms of service the Auxiliary renders as a hole—and more especially for the cause of Foreign Missions. The wful vision of collecting boxes, sewing parties, and sales of work t once comes before our minds, and in these the G.A. must cer- ainly bear a part.[1] But in addition, the G.A. holds itself partly esponsible for the missionary education of the Church, and serves y training youngsters in play hours, handwork classes, and junior .A.'s ; by running bookstalls and circulating libraries ; by getting p plays ; by arranging missionary evenings in other societies in e Church ; and by supplying the missionary committee with a eserve force of helpers to be drawn upon for all kinds of odd jobs. he crown of the G.A.'s service is seen in the small but steady tream of volunteers it sends up to the Mission House for service

[1] I.e., unless the Church has adopted the system of " Efficient Church Finance," hence these means of money-raising are unnecessary.—Ed.

abroad, and in that larger stream, not so easily counted, of girls entering spheres of social service at home and carrying the inspiration of their G.A. ideals into other departments of Church and school and mission work.

The G.A. has an age limit. Its members are expected to have retired gracefully some time before reaching the age of thirty-five! Each branch provides its own youthful secretaries, chairmen, lecturers, circle leaders, and the district and central committees are staffed in the same way. The object in having an age limit is to ensure that the G.A. shall really be a training ground for service and its youngest members have opportunities of practice in business methods and organization. The absence of more experienced elders, though it might be considered a drawback, does mean that restraint is removed, and diffidence in the matters of reading papers and leading prayer circles is more easily overcome.

Each branch pleases itself as to how often it meets and what it will do. One of the London branches holds once a month a long evening meeting for study, social intercourse and music—the study taking the form of lectures, discussions, papers by members and so on. In addition, a fortnightly prayer meeting is held on Sundays, and a study circle is run during the autumn. Other branches meet regularly once a week—perhaps taking alternate weeks for study and needlework. District committees co-ordinate the work of the branches, plan united meetings and make themselves responsible for extension work in the neighbourhood.

Since August 1921 there has been in existence a Central Committee, served by a General Secretary, whose headquarters are the Mission House at Westminster. The organ of the Auxiliary is a quarterly magazine—*Venture*—which *nearly* pays for itself!

The movement owes much of its life and strength to Conferences. Swanwick is the scene of a yearly reunion of members from all over the country, and it is here that the annual business meeting of the Auxiliary is held during the L.M.S. August Conference. Various smaller conferences are arranged by district committees at Easter and Whitsuntide, and in rare but happy week-end retreats our G.A. meets with representatives of the Baptists, Wesleyans and Presbyterians. It is in co-operation with the other denominations, in retreat, in local educational efforts, and in joint editorial work, that the movement has found some of its greatest help and inspiration.

GLADYS M. INGHAM.

NONCONFORMITY IN THE MODERN[1] UNIVERSITIES

The older Universities of Oxford and Cambridge are on a religious foundation. The Established Church has therefore had the prevailing influence, but in both there are vigorous Nonconformist societies which preserve the witness of the Free Churches where it might otherwise be lost. The value of these societies has diminished somewhat of late years by reason of the growing liberalism of the Universities themselves, the fellowship of the Student Christian Movement, and the cat-like propensities of the Wesleyans to "walk by their lone." Still, the societies exist, although what in precise language or in view of the actual terminal programmes is meant by "preserving a witness" I do not know.

The situation is different in every way in the modern Universities. All except one are on a non-religious basis; the Church of England is but one denomination among many, and somehow the business of "preserving a witness" is not felt to be necessary by the Nonconformists as such. As far as I know there are no Nonconformist Unions in any of the modern Universities.

The exception alluded to is Durham. Durham is heavily Anglican, the sort of thing that Oxford might have become if Mansfield had never gone there. There are four colleges, three of them with a chapel, and the fourth, University College, using the Cathedral. Theology predominates, and as there is little against which the budding, or even the flowered and fruited, theologians can sharpen their minds, the result is a somewhat dull orthodoxy. Here is a case for a Nonconformist witness. Perhaps it exists among the non-collegiates. At any rate, it is nowhere very much in evidence. The authorities are not "hidebound" or anything nasty like that; they are simply in the position of good men who have never had the privilege of adequate and continuous criticism.

Manchester[2] is a very vigorous University, with two large colleges in it and six theological colleges affiliated thereto. Five of these are Free Church. The complexion of the University is very largely Free Church, although it is not a place where these distinctions count for very much. No one, for instance, ever feels that it is "one up" for Nonconformity because Dr. Peake is Professor of Biblical Exegesis at Manchester, as they well might if he were Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. Indeed, the whole

[1] Including Durham, though the designation "modern" scarcely applies.

[2] See the article by Dr. R. Mackintosh (Congregational Quarterly, January 1924).

idea of "Nonconformity in the modern Universities" is almost beside the point. The division does not exist as such anywhere. Even the existence in most of them of strong "Churchmen's Unions" does not stir the Nonconformists into rivalry, for they know that the Churchmen's Unions contain mainly the "spikes," and there are more Anglicans outside them than inside. The Roman Catholics and the Jews have societies at Manchester, and the Wesleyans run a hostel for women, "Epworth House." The Primitive Methodists also have a University Students' Union of their own. But the witness of Nonconformity is expressed within the Student Christian Movement, the larger proportion of whose members belongs to the Free Churches.

Of Liverpool, Leeds, and Sheffield, the same is more or less true The United Methodist College at Sheffield is now closed. At Leeds[1] the Anglicans have a hostel for Mirfield (College of the Resurrection) men quite near the University, and they are therefore more in evidence in the Christian Union than are the Baptist College men at Rawdon, which is some miles away. The supposition, however, that a theological college placed in a University centre necessarily brings a particular denominational interest to bear on the University does not accord with the evidence.

Bristol provides a very interesting situation. The cleavage there is between the ultra-evangelicals and verbal inspirationists on the one side and everybody else on the other, a situation rather in keeping with the tradition of the city. It is worth remarking here that the modern civic University follows very closely in its main characteristics the city of which it is a part. In Bristol there has been a split in the Student Christian Movement, and a very eminent professor, who is at one and the same time a scientist and a Plymouth Brother, has started an organization for the stricter members of all the Churches. The cleavage is not denominational but doctrinal.

The remaining University is Birmingham. The religious tradition of Birmingham is curiously mixed. On the one side there are its Roman Catholic and High Anglican associations, and on the other the memory of Dr. Dale and a distinguished group of Unitarian families. Unitarianism is not the power in the city that it used to be, but the Anglican and Nonconformist elements are more or less evenly balanced, and do not seem to find any great difficulty in co-operating. The University holds two special services in the

[1] It has always seemed to us that twenty years ago Leeds University missed the opportunity of forming one of the finest theological faculties in the country. With Anglican colleges or training-schools at Mirfield, Ripon, and Leeds, a Wesleyan college at Headingley, a Baptist college at Rawdon, and a Congregational college at Bradford, there was a magnificent opening, but narrow prejudice combined with preoccupation with scientific and technical education to block the way. When one sees how many of the colleges mentioned have been closed or transferred, it is clear that the same opportunity is not likely to recur. Those responsible for the decision did the greatest possible disservice to the University and to the cause of University education in Yorkshire.—Ed.

year, one at the Cathedral and the other at Carrs Lane. Both are very well attended by everybody, and as far as the University is concerned, there is no great distinction made between Free Church and Anglican.

Just outside Birmingham is the Selly Oak group of colleges, chief of which is Woodbrooke. Until this year these colleges were a centre of Free Church interest only. Woodbrooke is Quaker; Kingsmead is a missionary college nominally Quaker but mainly Wesleyan; Carey Hall is a women's theological college run by the London, Baptist, and Presbyterian Missionary Societies; Westhill works under the auspices of the Sunday School Union for the training of Sunday School teachers; and Fircroft is a college of working men. This year there has been added a women's missionary training college, under the S.P.G., which should have a salutary influence in breaking up the uniformity of thought hitherto characteristic of the colleges. The colleges, it should be said, have no organic connexion with the University. The Wesleyan College is at Handsworth, and the students are allowed to count a certain amount of the theological work as a qualification for the Birmingham B.A.

It is interesting to notice the influence of the Student Christian Movement in all the Universities. It is very rarely that the denominational difference crops up within its ranks, and students are enrolled and become leaders often without anyone being aware of their particular Church affiliation. This is not because these things are a matter of indifference, but rather because of the equality observed in the foundation of the colleges. Where denominational societies exist it is mainly as a social bond and not at all as a doctrinal witness. The old lines of demarcation seem to be passing away, and the new lines differentiate between the people who are concerned about religious things and the people who are not so concerned. The modern Universities in this way reflect more truly the present religious orientation of the country than do the denominational societies of Oxford and Cambridge.

The chief difficulty in the modern University from this point of view comes from that very association with the city which has already been mentioned. For the great majority of students the University is not the real centre of their life. Their home still remains their centre, and any religious interests they have are expressed in their home Church. The proportion of students from a distance who are on the spot during week-ends is very small, and the proportion of those who are interested in religion is smaller still. Numbers of people who might exercise a useful influence in the University have their time already mortgaged at home. To some extent this was a problem at Oxford which arose chiefly through the attitude of the Wesleyans. The Wesleyan idea was that men should transfer their membership from their home Church to the

Oxford Church, and they tended thereby to draw out of the religious life of the college and University. Some Wesleyans in my time who were keen members of the Student Movement were strenuously opposed to this attitude, which they thought to be thoroughly mistaken. They felt that it made the interests of men denominational just at a time when they had the opportunity of a wider experience. It can be imagined therefore how much more acute the issue is in a non-residential civic University. To speak of Nonconformity in the University is, in practice, to speak of it in the city. The greater includes the less. Men come in to lectures, and when lectures are over they go home. Even at a debate in the Manchester University Union on a popular political subject the attendance does not rise much above two hundred, and usually it is far below that number. Even at an Inter-Varsity Rugby match the number of student spectators is just about the same. Yet the total of the University students is about 2,500. *Esprit de corps* is an almost impossible thing to create in the circumstances, and the vigour of University societies of every kind depends much on the corporate spirit of the college as a whole. But where four-fifths of the students live at home it is not easy to get any particular " witness " expressed.

A. V. Murray.

FOREIGN IMPRESSIONS AND REVIEWS

Das Heilige. By RUDOLPH OTTO. 11th Edition. Stuttgart: Perthes. 1923. Price uncertain.

Aufsätze das Numinous betreffend (Essays concerning the Numinous). By RUDOLPH OTTO. Stuttgart: Perthes. 1923.

The Idea of the Holy. By RUDOLPH OTTO. Translated by J. W. HARVEY. Oxford University Press. 1923. 7s. 6d.

The Paradox of Religion. A Study of Otto's *The Holy*. By DR. SYDNEY CAVE. (In *The Expositor*, February 1923.)

There is a general agreement among those who are acquainted with the movements of German thought that Professor Otto's *Das Heilige* is the most striking and original post-war contribution to theology.[1] It was first published in 1917, and has now reached an 11th edition. As far as we are aware, Dr. Sydney Cave was the first to call attention to it, which he did in an admirable article in *The Expositor*. Since this article was written the new edition of the book has appeared. Additions have been made to the text, which forms a volume by itself, the appendices (increased in number from twelve to twenty-seven) now making a separate volume entitled *Aufsätze das Numinous betreffend*. We shall refer to these volumes as I and II. There has also appeared an excellent translation by Mr. J. W. Harvey, Lecturer in Philosophy in the University of Birmingham. Otto's vocabulary and style are not easy. He invents new words and gives to old words unusual meanings. His style is pregnant and involved and sometimes obscure. Mr. Harvey has wrestled with these difficulties in an extraordinarily successful manner. But more than this, he has grasped Otto's thought and absorbed it. The whole argument has been weighed and examined and has emerged in an English form which is much more than a literal translation. The translator's Preface is a valuable piece of work, in which the significance of the book for English readers and its place and value in the thought of the world are indicated and its leading ideas and principles described. He also adds an appendix of his own (the 10th) on "The expression of the numinous in English," which contains some interesting illustrations from Coleridge, Addison, and Blake. We are sorry that for reasons of space he was compelled to leave out the long and important appendix on Wundt's *Völkerpsychologie*, to which we shall refer later. Mr. Harvey shows both courage and judgment when he translates the German word "irrational" by "non-rational," rather than by the corresponding English word "irrational." A careful study of all the cases (and they are numerous) in which this word is used has convinced me that Professor Otto means by "irrational" that which is *beyond* reason rather than that which is *against* reason. Dr. Cave in his article keeps to the word irrational; but I think "non-rational" makes the argument clearer to English readers. This article gives such an excellent analysis of Otto's argument that a further account of it would appear to be almost superfluous. Still as the more recent edition contains, especially in the appendices (Aufsätze), a good deal of fresh material, we

[1] Reference is made to Otto's work in the volumes of lectures by the Bishop of Ripon and the Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, both of them noticed in this issue.—ED.

venture to add a few notes, which we hope readers may find useful, as supplementary to Dr. Cave's "Study." Before doing this it may be as well for us to summarize very briefly Professor Otto's argument.

The conceptions about God, the rational attributes such as Spirit, Reason, Purpose, Goodness, Power, etc., do not exhaust the idea of Deity. There is in Otto's view a non-rational or a supra-rational background. Even the term "Holiness," which as a category of interpretation and valuation contains rational and ethical elements, is inadequate. There is an overplus of meaning, which is rather felt than thought, for which he adopts a new word coined from the Latin "numen." "Omen has given us ominous, and there is no reason why from numen (the most general Latin word for supernatural divine power) we should not similarly form a word 'numinous.'" (E.T., p. 7). Corresponding to this element in the objective world and in Deity, there is a definitely "numinous" state of mind in man, which is perfectly *sui generis* and irreducible to any other. In a deeply felt religious experience, as for example in worship, there is a sense of dependence which is something more than merely a feeling of dependence. "It is the emotion of the creature, abased and overwhelmed by its own nothingness in contrast to that which is supreme above all creatures" (E.T., p. 10). This creature-feeling is not primarily a form of self-consciousness, but the effect of another feeling which has immediate and primary reference to an object outside itself. This object is what Otto speaks of as the "numinous," which he proceeds to analyse. "The nature of the numinous can only be suggested by means of the special way in which it is reflected in the mind in terms of feeling" (E.T., p. 12). There is the element of Awfulness (Mysterium tremendum), producing the numinous reaction of fear as in the presence of the Wrath or the Jealousy of God; the element of Overpoweringness (Majestas) with the numinous reaction of humility; the element of Fascination (Fascinans) producing a sense of bliss and felicity. All these stirrings and feeling-reactions involve a unique kind of apprehension. Long ago the late Canon Liddon preached a sermon in St. Paul's Cathedral in which there is a striking anticipation of Otto: "David, in spite of his grievous falls, had upon his heart and conscience continually the impress—awful, yet most fascinating—of the Majesty, the Beauty, the Tenderness, the encompassing presence, the boundless Magnificence of God." These impressions Otto would say involved an unique kind of apprehension, not to be reduced to ordinary rational knowing, with its notions and concepts, and yet involving a genuine "knowing." As St. Paul would say, "being apprehended rather than apprehending." This is the "paradox of religion," which Dr. Cave makes the title of his "Study." All through the book and the appendices Otto is continually drawing a parallel between this numinous feeling with its awareness of the numinous in the objective world and the æsthetic feeling stirred by a beautiful thing. "A beautiful thing can only make an impression as such, i.e. as signifying beauty, if and in so far as a man possess in himself *a priori* the potentiality of framing a special standard of valuation, viz. æsthetic valuation" (I. 165). "While the taste is still undeveloped, a feeling or fore-feeling of the beautiful begins to stir, which must come from an obscure *a priori* conception of beauty already present" (I. 148). Or, in still more Kantian language, without the specific impulse and the feeling underlying it, no one could write the history of religion. It would be a geometry without Space. (II. 250.) Or again, a parallel from music. "Music-feeling" is rather (like numinous feeling) something "wholly other." These are irreducible elements, *a priori* elements, like the Kantian *a priori* elements in perception.

It will thus be clear that Otto's is a transcendental theology as Kant's is a transcendental philosophy. It is from this standpoint that he criticizes Wundt, according to whom myth and religion in their development are a product of "Fantasie" (cf. II. 213–252). But Otto points out that this development requires an objective world that impresses and stirs feeling, which would only be impressed and stirred if it possessed an "Anlage" (a predisposition) for the particular phenonema in question. Even in the most primitive and elementary religion no explanation is possible unless account is taken of a numinous element without, which is as it were a stimulant to a numinous element within.

So far little or nothing has been said about "the Holy". We shall be prepared to understand that though the word may be charged for us with rational and ethical elements, these do not exhaust its meaning. As Mr. Harvey says in his preface: "Though in our final experience of God's Holiness, perfect goodness has an absolutely essential and central place, yet there remains a something beyond. Holiness or sanctity has an element in it independent of the category of the good" (p. xii). In its presence we are conscious of something else beside the transgression of the moral law, namely a feeling of absolute "profaneness." It was this feeling that wrung from Isaiah the cry, "I am a man of unclean lips and dwell among a people of unclean lips." In the *Aufsätze* (pp. 136–153) Otto gives an analysis of the prophets' experience of God, specially emphasizing that of Isaiah. Jehovah manifests Himself in judgment, and God the Holy One is sanctified in righteousness. Otto interprets this as meaning that righteousness is embraced by holiness, which is, however, not exhausted by it. Righteousness is a predicate but not a definition of holiness. The holiness demanded and desired by Isaiah, which the Scriptures increasingly urge as the ideal for man (and also the "better Righteousness" of the Gospel) is, in its very nature and quality, an attitude of the whole self to God, it is to "be not fashioned according to this world," to be not fleshly in Paul's sense, but to be spiritual, to be transformed by the spirit. This involves the fulfilment of moral demands, but also the honouring of God and becoming His people in a deeper sense. In the light of these considerations Otto (in appendices 21–24) unfolds the meaning of sin, the true significance of the war of the flesh against the spirit, the Christian idea of the state of being lost, and the doctrine of original sin. His discussion of these great themes irresistibly reminded me of that remarkable sermon preached nearly thirty years ago by our revered Dr. Forsyth at Leicester on "Holy Father," which was such a heart-stirring challenge to the theological tendencies of the time. My memory of the sermon is unfortunately vague, and I have been unable to obtain a copy of it, but that it anticipated some of Dr. Otto's conclusions I am convinced. Dr. Forsyth would have been among the first to welcome this book and to recognize that it was a valuable corrective of a shallow and sentimental theology that robbed the gospel of its redemptive meaning and purpose. In Otto's view the natural man, even the merely moral man, does not understand the meaning of sin and will therefore be disposed to dismiss the idea of deliverance or redemption with a shrug of the shoulders. The deeper idea of "Holiness" as containing more than moral elements, the deeper consciousness of sin (so rare to-day) as meaning more than moral lapse, gives to the felt need for atonement a new basis in experience which makes the merely moral view of it seem superficial. The glory of Christianity, its title to be the most complete and the most profound religion, is that it gathers up and intensifies what is felt or half felt in all religious experience, and yet provides not merely a symbol but

a way of reconciliation whereby a blessed relation of union is restored between the sinful creature and the Holy Father. Such a view and such an experience will preserve us (to use Dr. Cave's words) from regarding God as a Santa Claus whose one work is to make us happy. The easy and comfortable worship of a merely soft and good-natured deity will never produce a strong type of character or a fervent type of devotion. Gervase Alard in *The End of the House of Alard* hopes that if he ever gets religion it will be a religion of a good stiff sort, that will give him a devil of a time, something more than a comfortable service at 11, a comfortable sermon that makes him feel good, followed by a comfortable car to go home in, with a climax in roast beef for dinner. Such a system will never appeal to manly men. It will mean nothing to them and have no real value. Perhaps the time has come when we should place at the centre of our theology and emphasize more constantly in our preaching a God who is Father, but who is also the Holy, the August, the Majestic. And if our concepts and categories of thought fail us, as they do not only in this but in other ranges of experience, we may trust more those deeper feelings and predispositions to which Otto so frequently refers to bring us into direct contact with reality.

Professor Otto devotes considerable attention to the problem of the origin of religion, its earliest as well as its latest manifestations. He has had direct contact with primitive religions and is fortunate in having a first-hand acquaintance with Indian and particularly Sanskrit literature. The appendices contain a great deal of new and valuable material drawn from these sources that throws light on the origin of religion and that confirms the main thesis of his book. Religion can never be explained by anything that is not religion—by the fear of ghosts, veneration for ancestors. It is no product of the collective crowd consciousness. It is explicable only by the "numinous," which cannot be explained by anything else. There may be bodily conditions, and mental and emotional conditions, suggestibility, and responsiveness to external impressions, but "such conditions are conditions and not causes" (I. 143). Behind all religion and religious experience there is a transcendent something—a real operative entity of a "numinous" kind with which men come in contact through the "numinous" predisposition (Anlage) within themselves. The cruder phases and the developed and highest phases of religious experience are brought together and unified not by levelling all down to the least and the lowest element contained within them, but by seeing in them the evidence of an influence dæmonic or divine that lifts man beyond himself. Otto's illustrations from the *Upanishads* and from the *Bhagavad-Gita* and from living movements in India with which he has come into contact are specially valuable for the student of comparative religion, and exhibit in another form the experience of the numinous which lies at the heart of all religion. In Christianity this comes to perfect and complete expression. Looking at the whole movement of the development of religion from his wide knowledge of both its primitive and developed forms, he can say at the conclusion of his criticism of Wundt: "a true Psychology of Religion and a true and accurate History of Religion must be a History of Grace" (II. 251). The closing chapters of the first volume are devoted to an account of the functioning of the numinous element in man, which he calls a faculty of divination. Through this faculty we have "surmises" of a Reality fraught with mystery and momentousness. This faculty is more developed in some men than in others. Prophets and apostles possessed it in an unique degree. But we all possess it, and it may be developed in us so as to give us a deeper and truer understanding

of Christianity if the mind submits itself to a pure impression of the object" (E.T., p. 172). Referring to Christ and His atoning work he says: "Whoever can immerse himself in contemplation and open his whole mind resolutely to a pure impression of all this combined will surely find growing in him, obedient to an inward standard that defies expression, the pure feeling of the recognition of Holiness, the intuition of the eternal in the temporal" (E.T., p. 173). But such a conclusion is not a result of logical compulsion (Zwang)—"it is an immediate underived judgment of pure recognition, and it follows a premise that defies exposition and springs directly from an irreducible feeling of the truth" (E.T., p. 174). How Dr. Forsyth would have welcomed the words with which we must close this all too inadequate notice: "In applying to the Cross of Christ the category 'Holy,' Christian religious feeling has given birth to a religious intuition profounder and more vital than any to be found in the whole history of religion."

The Decay and the Restoration of Civilization. By ALBERT SCHWEITZER. Translated by C. T. CAMPION. A. and C. Black. 1923. 5s.

Civilization and Ethics. By ALBERT SCHWEITZER. Translated by Dr. JOHN NAISH. A. and C. Black. 1923. 10s. 6d.

Ethik Der Zukunft. By various authors (edited by Dr. FRITZ DEHNOW). Leipzig: Reisland. 1923.

Our sincere thanks are due to the Council of Mansfield College for inviting Dr. Albert Schweitzer to give the Dale Memorial Lectures in Oxford, and for facilitating the publication of the two volumes which contain the distinguished author's reflections on civilization. He tells us in the preface to the first volume that he has worked at this theme for over twenty years, and that it was finally ripened in the stillness of the primeval forest of Equatorial Africa. As is well known, Dr. Schweitzer's range of culture is remarkable and his career full of romance. As a comparatively young man he achieved European renown by his brilliant book *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* (1906), translated into English under the title, happily chosen, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. While Professor in the Theological Faculty at Strasbourg he graduated in medicine, and in 1914 gave up all his European prospects and a position of commanding influence in order to minister to the physical and spiritual needs of the people of Central Africa. He is also a musical expert and the leading authority on Bach. During his lectures in Oxford he gave a Bach recital on the organ which greatly impressed those who heard it. Dr. Schweitzer's experiences as a missionary doctor are described in *On the Edge of the Primeval Forest*, a most inspiring missionary book, which we believe will become a classic.

The lectures were delivered in French, but when the typescript arrived it was found that they were written in German. We have unfortunately not seen the original text (which has not been published), but the translations show signs of great care and give a clear and often elegant expression of the writer's thought. His wide knowledge and varied experience are reflected in his style, which is much more vivid and graphic than in his earlier books. Communion with the forest and the sea and life on board ship have had their influence in making it more picturesque, and a wide knowledge of music, together with a mastery of its technique, have also enriched it. "It is characteristic of European thought that it plays almost exclusively on the upper octaves, leaving the lower untouched. Its ethics

is all treble and no bass" (II. 237). "We do not allow it (the community) to be our guardian or to speak for us in matters of ethics. To do so would be like the solo-violinist allowing the orchestral seconds to dictate his time" (p. 274). The lectures are full of happy similes that keep them bright, and, though the argument is profound and the historical review of ethical thought long, the interest of the reader never flags.

While the stillness of the primeval forest has its advantages for the quiet maturing of thought, Schweitzer has had to pay for it in the loss of that challenge of running criticism from friends and colleagues which during the process of incubation keeps our ideas from premature birth.

We should be the last to suggest that Schweitzer's ideas are premature. The lectures leave the impression of an almost fierce concentration of mind on the perils and the failures of civilization. Perhaps distance enabled the author to view Europe in better perspective, but daily contact with keen minds confronted with the same series of facts or incidents is valuable in keeping our thoughts from being over-simplified. One feels this in reading such people as Macchiavelli, Hobbes, and Marx, who all wrote their best known and most influential works in exile. Thought is a social product and too much isolation is apt to distort it.

We are far from denying the justice of Schweitzer's criticism of Western civilization. Most of us would agree when he says: "Our civilization is doomed because it has developed with much greater vigour materially than it has spiritually" (II. 2). It is like a ship with defective steering geer, which becomes more unsteerable moment by moment and so rushes on to catastrophe. We also agree that the grave crisis of civilization through which we are passing is not due to the war: the war was rather due to it. Still, the reading of the lectures has left upon the mind a feeling, perhaps more vague than definite, that full justice has not quite been done to civilization, that thought has been so concentrated on its failures and defects that its brighter and more hopeful aspects have passed into the shade. We have sometimes found ourselves asking whether Dr. Schweitzer's philosophy is the philosophy which the late Sir Henry Jones defined as only the common consciousness which seeks to do justice to *all the facts*. The consciousness of the good in our civilization is not merely an excuse for conservatism; it is a necessary qualification for those who would lay violent hands upon it. However, this mild criticism may be due to temperament. We are all inclined to see what we want to see.

The main lines of Schweitzer's argument are firmly drawn with masterly skill. The absence of world-view, of reflective thought upon the real meaning of civilization, and the superficial character of modern philosophizing, is responsible for the present drifting and despair. We have ventured to place side by side with Schweitzer's massive lectures the much slighter volume of essays on *The Ethic of the Future*. There can be no comparison between them, for of the twenty essays only three have any interest —those by the biologist Ziegler and by Professor Paul Barth. The value of the volume is that it exhibits the very tendencies of contemporary thought which Schweitzer so severely criticizes—especially in the first of the two series of lectures. There is not only an absence of reflection on the ultimate problems of ethics, but a scorn for them. Ethical theory and ethical practice are determined by biological principles and categories. They have no rights and standards and ideals of their own that give them dignity and meaning. Progress consists in a push from behind, not in a call from in front.

Schweitzer makes an earnest plea for a new and higher world-view, and for the reflection which such a view demands. It is a defect of our

age that less and less time is given to meditation and more and more time to research. This wrongful emphasis must be corrected. "We are behaving, really, like boys who give themselves up exultingly to the forces of nature and whizz down a hill on their toboggan without asking themselves whether they will be able to steer their vehicle successfully when they come to the next bend or the next unexpected obstacle" (I. 42). The trouble is that we are not aiming at any definitely planned goal; we live from hand to mouth, and suppose that because we understand the past we possess the key to the future. The decadence of our civilization finds its completion in Nationalism. Territorial economic interests predominate over all other interests, with the inevitable result that our age has reversed the relation between the spiritual and the actual. There can be little hope for the future unless we act on the conviction "that the spirit is everything and that institutions count for very little" (p. 60). Schweitzer urges the importance of the individual as the sole agent of the restoration of civilization. It can only revive when a number of individuals acquire a tone of mind independent of the one prevalent among the crowd and in opposition to it. "It is only an ethical movement which can rescue us from the slough of barbarism, and the ethical comes into existence only in individuals" (p. 73). A new age can only be created by new ideas, and these ideas can only come from personalities. Hence his advocacy of a new rationalism, apart from which there can be no real progress. If we ask what are the new ideas which this rationalism formulates, the answer is that life possesses a value in itself, and our first and highest duty is to raise existence to its highest level of value, and thus assert the lordship of spirit over the powers of nature. The future of civilization depends on the degree of success we achieve in this both in thought and in practice. Hence there comes a call and a challenge to individuals to revise their convictions and ideals, and to give these as a new gold currency to their contemporaries.

The greater part of the lectures in the second volume is devoted to the history of Western ethical thought from the earliest times to our own time, but Schweitzer does not confine himself to Western thought. He continually refers to Eastern and particularly to Chinese thought and experience. The point in his survey that we should be most inclined to challenge is his insistence that the ethics of Jesus and of Christianity are pessimistic as regards world-view. This may be a reflection of the emphasis that he gives in his earlier writings to the apocalyptic element in the teaching of Jesus. Is it quite fair to say that "the religion of Jesus is not a religion of action with a view to the transformation of the world, but a religion of expectation of the end of the world" (II. 71)? According to Schweitzer it was the new knowledge that marked the dawn of the modern period that inspired an affirmative and optimist world-view and identified the spirit of Jesus with the process by which the world is transformed rather than abandoned. We cannot agree that the original essence of Christianity was pessimistic and that this was transformed into optimism by the modern mentality based on knowledge and power. It seems to us that the facts are capable of an interpretation that assigns to the original essence of Christianity a more positive and affirmative purpose. In the course of history it may have lost sight of this, and the value of the new knowledge may have been in restoring to Christianity its original meaning and purpose.

But we must leave this interesting question and pass over the valuable survey of modern ethical theory in order to devote our remaining space to a brief summary of Schweitzer's positive contribution to ethical theory and practice. What does he understand by Civilization? "It is the summary

and content of all real advances of man and society in all fields and in every direction in so far as these are subordinate to the spiritual fulfilment of the individual as being the real goal of all progress." (II. 8). This spiritual fulfilment is actualized in a reverence for life which is the creative force that will restore civilization, and is quite independent of world-development. He leaves this latter on one side as inscrutable. "Civilization is not a phenomenon of objective world-development, but rather an adventure of the subjective will-to-live which we cannot connect with objective occurrences as we know these externally—nor in fact do we need to do so" (II. p. 279). The inevitability and the finality of this dualism may perhaps be questioned. Thought cannot rest permanently in a will-to-live that is out of relation to the objective world. It is, according to Schweitzer, the knowledge which is derived from the will-to-live rather than that derived from the objective world that must determine ethical theory and guide ethical practice. Productive action alone flows from this, for "the essential nature of the will-to-live is found in this, that it is determined to live itself out. It bears in itself the impulse to realize itself to the highest degree possible of perfection" (p. 222). Thus we find within rather than without ourselves the meaning of our existence. The only becoming attitude for us therefore is one of awe and reverence in the face of life, and this is to be "in the grip of the eternal, unoriginated, forward-pushing will, which is the foundation of all being" (p. 223). Reverence for life provides the impulse for moral action. It involves or contains within it both self-sacrifice and self-fulfilment. This defines not only our proper attitude to our fellow creatures but to all creatures, to all life. In this connection Dr. Fritz Dehnow's essay "Mensch und Tier" (Man and the Animal world) in the *Ethic of the Future* is interesting. On the ground of intelligence (even powers of calculating) in animals he urges a greater respect and sympathy for animal life. Schweitzer derives from reverence for life the fundamental principle of morality. "It is *good* to maintain and cherish life; it is *evil* to destroy and to check life." Eloquently, nobly does he advocate and apply this principle. "Whatever you have received more than others in health, in talents, in ability, in success, in pleasant childhood, in harmonious conditions of home life, all this you must not take to yourself as a matter of course. You must pay a price for it. You must render in return an unusually great sacrifice of your life for other life" (p. 267). The last pages glow with a warm enthusiasm for humanity, with an exultant joy for sacrifice and service, the depth and sincerity of which are demonstrated by the author himself in renouncing the pleasant life of culture for the hard life of a medical missionary in Africa.

W. Blackshaw.

CURRENT LITERATURE

" Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

" A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London, and the date* 1923 *or* 1924, *unless otherwise stated.*)

Reunion. The Lambeth Conference Report and the Free Churches. S.P.C.K. 4d.

In Defence of the English Church. By H. HENSLEY HENSON, D.D. Hodder. 2s. 6d.

Report of the Anglo-Catholic Congress, 1923. SOCIETY OF SS. PETER AND PAUL. 6s.

Causes of the Present Conflict of Ideals in the Church of England. BY R. D. RICHARDSON, B.A., B.Litt. Murray. 6s.

A Century of Anglican Theology. By C. C. J. WEBB, LL.D. Blackwell. 5s.

Authority and Freedom. By A. E. J. RAWLINSON, B.D. Longmans. 7s. 6d.

Catholic and Protestant Elements in Christianity. By O. C. QUICK, M.A. Longmans. 6s.

The First Book of the Irenicum of John Forbes of Corse. Translated and edited by E. G. SELWYN, M.A. Cambridge University Press. 12s. 6d.

Church Principles. By P. CARNEGIE SIMPSON, D.D. Hodder. 5s.

After the Lambeth Appeal it was inevitable that the Church of England should make some gesture both to Rome and to the Free Churches, and there was no reason for outcry and alarm because several members of the Anglican Church went to Malines. Such a visit is, we think, rather to be welcomed, because many Anglican clergymen need to be reminded how Rome regards them and their ministries, and how little she is disposed to change. Negotiations with the Free Churches, such as those chronicled in the *Report* published by the S.P.C.K., can have no practical outcome until the relation of the Anglican Church to Rome is clearly defined. As the Bishop of Durham says, in the vigorous onslaught on Anglo-Catholicism now published in book form: " It is obvious that no serious advance in the great matter of Reunion can be made until these questions have been answered." What the Bishop calls " the continuing disorders and domestic bickerings " make it very difficult for observers to discover for what the Church of England stands, especially at a time when, as he says, " the English people is no longer interested as it once was in the English Church."

The books before us represent almost all the different schools of thought in the Church of England to-day; they help us to realize what a difficult team the Archbishop of Canterbury has to drive.

All who were disturbed by the well-advertised and well-organized

Anglo-Catholic Congress last July will be reassured as they read the *Report* of the speeches. We have tried to imagine how a perusal of this volume would affect two College contemporaries of ours—good fellows without ecclesiastical ties—and we are sure they would be neither converted to Anglo-Catholicism nor very much interested. There are some able addresses, and the earnestness of a fanatic like the Bishop of Zanzibar is always attractive; but the vast majority of Englishmen will be repelled both by the boast that there are now 11,405 churches where "the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is offered every Sunday," and by the assumption that only those live "the religious life" who have taken vows. The Anglo-Catholics represented by this volume appear a long way from the "Evangelical Catholicity" desiderated by Mr. Rawlinson.

To discover the Modern Churchman's point of view we turned to Mr. Richardson with expectancy and hope. His is a difficult book to review. Its genesis, we imagine, is to be found in the fact that an enthusiastic young Modern Churchman desired to kill two birds with one stone—to "have a go" at the Anglo-Catholics and at the same time obtain a B.Litt. degree. He has, apparently, been successful, though it is not clear what claim this book has to be considered "original research" or "a contribution to learning." Authorities are almost invariably quoted at second or third-hand (even Coleridge comes to us *via* Inge), and the many mistakes and lack of knowledge in the pages dealing with the Elizabethan Church do not inspire confidence. It may safely be said that the author knows very little about Nonconformity—either its past history or its present position. The Independents come off very badly. Thus we have:

> p. 44: "In 1568 [why is this year chosen?] Robert Browne [then, by the way, a youth in his 'teens] who *affected* [italics ours] Puritan theology with a Presbyterian and Congregational system of Church Government, seceded."
>
> p. 61: "Only the death of Cromwell prevented the establishment of Independency as the religious system of England." [The "Triers" had passed Presbyterians, Baptists, and even Episcopalians as ministers as well as Independents, and Cromwell's views on toleration are well known.]
>
> p. 229: "The Independents have been largely destroyed by the tide of Biblical criticism." [Where? Can it possibly be true that Mr. Richardson has spent some years in Oxford? Let him contrast the influence of Independency there with what it was fifty years ago.]

Mr. Richardson would have been well advised to stick to the Church and the period he knows—possibly to reconcile the contradiction between such statements as "the present anarchical state of the Church" (p. vi) and "Truly it may be said that religious life is fitful and uncertain apart from the main stream of the Church" (p. 230).

And yet, with all its blunders, this is not a bad book. Where it keeps to its main point—Authority, and where it is to be found, in Church, Bible, or Rational, Moral, and Spiritual Consciousness—it has much that is pertinent to say, reinforced by lavish quotations. If Mr. Richardson had started at the beginning and not at the end, if he had set out to trace the incidence of authority in the Church of England from the Reformation onward, rather than starting from the present conflict [in a Church where there is nothing "fitful and uncertain"], he might have given us a very valuable book. As it is, after being encouraged by useful suggestions and wise comments, we are made ill by learning that, if Church and State were severed, "the Church would no longer be as wide as the nation, but would

ollapse into three or more wretched sects, one of which would soon join he Roman Communion." "As wide as the nation"? Is it one in ten, r twenty, or thirty, of the population? "Wretched sects"? Does Mr. Richardson prefer what the Bishop of Durham calls the "falsehood and eceit" of the present day? "The Roman Communion"? Would not hat be infinitely more honest for the "sect" and better for the Church? Ve have dealt so critically with a book that is not without promise because t is disappointing to find young Modernists writing thus. If they do this n the green tree, what will they do in the dry?

It is a relief to pass from the heated polemic of Bishop Henson and Mr. Richardson to the next four books. Professor Webb's scholarly lectures re marked by his usual broadminded tolerance. The first three cover art of Mr. Richardson's ground, and present a clear and mature account f the development of thought in the Anglican Church in the nineteenth entury, testifying, incidentally, to the influence of the Nonconformist Colleges in Oxford. Three further lectures deal with Morality and Religion, nd one with "Theology as the Science of Religious Experience."

Quarter by quarter we like to suggest one or two books into which it ight be well for ministerial readers to put their teeth: this quarter they ould find nothing better than the volumes by Mr. Rawlinson (Paddock ectures) and Canon Quick. They both go to the root of things, and—hough at times they provoke dissent—make one think through one's ositions, as well as set the mind working on new lines. Mr. Rawlinson elieves that "Protestantism has worked itself out," having "taught its nforgettable lesson," and that it is now necessary to return to the Catholic deal. The trend, however, is to unity and synthesis, and not to Rome. Rome's superstitions must not be taken over, and there must be radical nodifications of Rome's claims and a new conception of authority, but it s possible to reconcile Catholicity and Freedom. [In the re-united Church, y the way, there must be room for the Reserved Sacrament and for Benediction.] Mr. Rawlinson believes that there will be no serious split in the Anglican Church: the parties in it will so combine that in the end their eligion "will cease to be Anglican, it will simply be Christianity, Catholic, vangelical, free" ("Catholic" being the one adjective with a capital letter). This summary does less than justice to an excellent book. The first lectures —Authority and Freedom, Authority without Freedom, The Reaction gainst Authority, The Authority of Revelation—will bear reading again nd again.

Of the same high quality is Canon Quick's book. Judged by quantity —it would occupy but fifty of these pages—it is a dear book, but every entence is of value. It consists of five lectures—The Historic Faith, The Doctrine of Sacraments, Religious Consciousness (Knowledge), Religious Consciousness (Desire), and The Kingdom of God—and all are full of meat. Those who desire a volume that gets below the surface and is not satisfied vith casual and desultory debate should try this one.

John Forbes, the most learned of the "Aberdeen Doctors," published is *Irenicum* in 1629. In 1618 James I had persuaded the Church of cotland to pass the five "Perth Articles," which enjoined Kneeling at Communion, Confirmation and the observance of the chief Holy Days, nd permitted Private Baptism and Private Communion. Supported by he upholders of Episcopacy, these articles were opposed by the Presbyterians n lines familiar to those acquainted with the writings of the Elizabethan Puritans. Forbes's work, written in Latin, played an important part in long controversy, but its author suffered the frequent fate of peacemakers —he was deprived of his professorship and exiled. The editor of *Theology*

has given us this scholarly translation of *The First Book of the Irenicum* as a contribution to the theology of reunion, and his notes and appendices will probably assist the desired end far more than many more direct efforts.

In *Church Principles* Dr. Carnegie Simpson prints notes prepared for the conversations at Lambeth. They present the Free Church case with conviction, cogency, and courtesy. Whether he is dealing with the Apostolical Succession, Rome, the Sacraments, or State Control, Dr. Simpson is clear and definite. It is good to know that the Free Church position is being put before the Bishops so lucidly, and this book should be widely read. We should like a similar book from the side of the Bishops to tell us what is the position of the Church of England.

EDITOR.

Voluntary Clergy. By ROLAND ALLEN. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

The Art of Preaching. By CHARLES R. BROWN. New York: Macmillan Co. 1922. $1.75.

The Town Parson. By PETER GREEN, M.A. Longmans. 6s.

The Teaching Ministry for To-morrow. By B. W. BACON. Yale and Oxford Univ. 4s. 6d.

Preaching as a Fine Art. By R. C. SMITH. New York: Macmillan Co. $75.

We are not sure that Mr. Allen's thought-provoking book does not point to the ultimate solution of the problem of the ministry, not only in the Church of England to which he belongs, but in all the Churches. His argument is as follows: Why is it assumed that the call to the ministry comes only to the young? Do not the young often mistake their vocation, and does not experience at home and abroad show that early ordination is as unwise as it is unnatural? Why should vocation be determined by a literary test suitable only for the young? Why should it be assumed that an older man while still at work in another calling cannot be called to the ministry? It is unscriptural to limit ordination to young men and to full-time men, and the limitation handicaps the Church. There should therefore be voluntary clergy, in full orders, but gaining their livelihood in other ways. Mr. Allen's is a small book, but it is very valuable.

Dean Brown's position and experience give him the right to speak with authority, and his Lyman Beecher lectures are full of wise counsel, penetrating criticism, and apt suggestion. It is good to know that so many Congregational students come under the influence of one who believes in the power of the preachéd Word and who is the embodiment of sanctified common sense. The only defect in the lectures is Dean Brown's failure to obey one of his own canons, that humour should be sparingly used and the preacher should never go out of his way to make a joke. The Dean has a pretty, if mordant, wit which at times seems to be his master rather than his servant; it is possible to have too much even of a very good thing.

Everything that Canon Green writes is marked by solid good sense, and all ministers could read this new edition of his lecturers on Pastoral Theology with advantage, though Free Churchmen would have to translate some of the chapters into their own vernacular as they went along. In a new preface Canon Green emphasizes the necessity of "straight-forward. simple, day-in-day-out pastoral work," and expresses his belief that such work is not done as it was a generation ago. He is right, and therein lies one of the chief reasons for the decline in church going.

Prof. Bacon's lecture is as incisive as everything he writes, and here

ne faces the problem of the ministry in the States. Untrained and non-collegiate men are pressing into the ministry; the "fundamentalist" is abroad in the land; preachers fail to pass on to the pew the truths they know—on all these questions Dr. Bacon has important things to say, but 4s. 6d. for 42 pages of printed matter is a dear price to pay.

Dr. Smith's slight study of the preacher as artist ends: "That's art. Amen. So be it."

EDITOR.

Ignatius Loyola. By H. D. SEDGWICK. Macmillan. 15s.

Wilberforce. A Narrative. By R. COUPLAND. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 16s.

The Story of a Great Schoolmaster. Being a Plain Account of the Life and Ideas of Sanderson of Oundle. By H. G. WELLS. Chatto and Windus. 4s. 6d.

Timothy Richard of China. By W. E. SOOTHILL, M.A. Seeley, Service. 12s. 6d.

Fifty Years in Madagascar. By James Sibree, D.D. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

Ion Keith-Falconer of Arabia. By JAMES ROBSON, M.A. Hodder. 3s. 6d.

Here are six stimulating biographies, all of them of good men, some of them of men who have influenced the world.

Mr. Sedgwick has attempted to supply the lack of an adequate English biography of Loyola, and he has met with a considerable measure of success. To him Loyola was, above all, a "passionate believer in holiness," to whom Lord Rosebery's description of Cromwell is applicable—"a practical mystic, the most formidable and terrible of all combinations." Mr. Sedgwick's practised pen makes Loyola live before us, and we are alternately attracted by his faith and devotion and repelled by his severity and superstition. The founding and development of the Society of Jesus, with its insistence on absolute obedience, are clearly traced, and the work of the first Fathers described.

The biography is not without its faults. The serious reader is always annoyed to find notes lumped together at the end of a book, and one does not expect, in a work of this kind, to meet "I believe," "as far as I remember," "as I understand it," and "while I am about it" so frequently. There is some repetition and signs of lack of care in revision—on consecutive pages we are told "I shall return" [to the same point] later in the book. Mr. Sedgwick is also a little too fond of psychology and psycho-analysis. How does he know of Erasmus that "certainly it never entered his head to break with the Church"? One would like to have the original words of Loyola paraphrased by Mr. Sedgwick: "That was all there was to it"!

Not since we rushed to the Library for volume after volume of (*pace* Mr. F. Chamberlin) Froude's *History* have we read a narrative so entrancingly written as that of Professor Coupland. Once one has started the story it is difficult to lay it down. The biography—despite the author's modest preface—meets a real need, for few people get far within the five-volume tombstone beneath which Robert and Samuel carefully buried their worthy father. Every part of Wilberforce's career receives full and scholarly treatment—the reader is sorry when the time comes for Pitt to leave the stage—and Wilberforce, though his warts are not omitted, is revealed as the great man he was.

Mr. Wells's *Sanderson* is an interesting and disappointing book—the former because it lets us see so much of Mr. Wells, the latter because it lets us see so little of Sanderson. At times, as in the sermons and Scripture lessons, the voice is that of the authentic Sanderson, but often where the voice is said to come from Oundle, the views are those of Wells. The novelist is so accustomed to speak through his characters that he forgets that biography is not fiction. Some of Mr. Wells's recent literary adventures have been so unfortunate that it would be well for him and for the public if he would return to his job, which we conceive to be the writing of novels, by which means his keen intellect has done, and can still do, much to stimulate the Anglo-Saxon race. As a theologian Mr. Wells speaks with no authority, and he seems as little abreast of matters educational as of matters theological. The astonishment he expresses at finding the writings of Nietzsche, Bertrand Russell, and Shaw on Sanderson's shelves in 1914 is either impudence or ignorance. He says:

> "Here was a schoolmaster, a British public schoolmaster, aware that the world was still going on! It was too good to be true."

Similarly we learn that "Orthodox Christianity is built upon the doctrine of the Fall of Man and the damnation of mankind," and a sermon of Sanderson's is quoted, which, we are told, "no competent theological body" would accept "as consistent with the teaching of any recognized Christian Church." This sermon might have been preached without causing comment in any Congregational Church any time during the present century! The fact is that the Church and the theology Mr. Wells so joyfully castigates are those of his youth—and we should not wonder if the same thing is true about teaching and the schools. Sanderson rendered a great service to the cause of education: he himself would have regretted that anyone should find it necessary to magnify that service by depreciating the work of others.

Timothy Richard's is a thrilling story—that of a lifetime spent in the service of China—Professor Soothill calls him "seer, statesman, missionary, and the most disinterested adviser the Chinese ever had." Richard was in the front rank of missionary statesmen, and there is no doubt that missionary enterprise will develop on the educational and literary lines he continually advocated. One trembles to think of the possibilities of China for good or ill, and a book like this is a great stimulus to effort and sacrifice. On the whole Professor Soothill has done his work in scholarly fashion, and given us a well-balanced biography.

In *Fifty Years in Madagascar* Dr. James Sibree offers some vivid descriptions of his life and work. The veteran L.M.S. missionary is held in high respect throughout Congregationalism, and this informing and well-illustrated book about the lights and shadows of Church life in the great island will be widely read. A map would have been useful, and slips on pp. 97 and 151 need to be corrected.

Mr. Robson's *Ion Keith-Falconer* (one of the "Master Missionary" series) describes how a youth of noble birth and brilliant parts, eminent both in scholarship and in sport, went out to Aden and Sheikh Othman at his own expense to preach the Gospel to the Muslims. Years of preparation were followed by a few months of active service, and then fever put an end to a devoted life at the age of thirty-one. Mr. Robson, who now labours in Sheikh Othman, tells the story plainly and well.

EDITOR.

The Pharisees. By R. Travers Herford, B.A. Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.

Probably the learned librarian of Dr. Williams's library has a better acquaintance with Rabbinical literature than any non-Jew in this country. An acknowledged authority on Pharisaism, he has now employed the works of Lauterbach and others in this very readable volume, which traces the history of the Pharisees, describes their relation to the Torah, to Tradition, and to the Synagogue, summarizes their teaching, and then outlines their relationship to Apocalyptic literature, to Jesus, and to Christianity. The distinguishing feature of the work of the Pharisees is shown to be the creation and transmission of the Halachah—statements of right conduct interpreting the Torah.

Mr. Herford carried us along with him for the first part of his book, which we read with a growing feeling of uneasiness. To know that one has been unjust does not make for inward peace, and evidence seemed to be abundant that Christians had looked on the Pharisees from one point of view only, and treated them very badly. We are sorry that feeling did not remain with us to the end of the book, for there is no doubt that the "bad name" given to the Pharisees has been too easily accepted by Christians. Under Mr. Herford's treatment of Apocalyptic, however, it began to wane, and in the chapter on the N.T. the conviction that Mr. Herford was a pronounced advocate became so strong that we began to wonder if our sympathies with the Pharisees had not been too easily aroused. We read:

> "Jesus had no close acquaintance with the tradition he denounced . . . denounced . . . with none the less fierceness because he knew little or nothing about it."

But, on Mr. Herford's own showing, how could he have the "inside knowledge" he is blamed for not having? He is said to have been one of the Am-ha-aretz, while "the theoretical discussion and definition of the Halachah was confined to the assemblies of the Rabbis."

It was "by their fruits" that Jesus judged men, and if Pharisaism had been the power for good Mr. Herford claims, the answer to Jesus would have been easy. Surely it was just because the Halachah tended to make religion an esoteric thing that Jesus came into conflict with its teachers. We believe the author is right to claim that "Pharisaism was no 'organized hypocrisy,' no dead corpse of a living religion," but it is, nevertheless, wrong to think of it as if it always reached its ideal. While Jesus did not know Pharisaism from the inside, Paul (who did)

> "presented a mere travesty of Judaism, and nothing can ever make his picture anything else. . . . Paul is the last person who ought to be relied on as a witness to the nature of Pharisaism."

The observer who has always been outside Pharisaism does not satisfy Mr. Herford, nor does the observer who came from within and stood outside. Mr. Herford is surely wrong in thinking that the one standing within all the time is likely to have a perspective any more correct.

We thank Mr. Herford for giving us an extremely useful book. It is very invigorating, and, as will be gathered, provocative, but it will set many students to work on a very important subject. There is no doubt that many Christians have been content with the N.T. picture of the Pharisees, and this book will serve as a reminder that there are other points of view.

Editor.

Social Development. By L. T. Hobhouse. Allen & Unwin. 12s. 6d.

This is the fourth and last volume in the very important series of books which Professor Hobhouse has written on the Principles of Sociology. In the earlier volumes he has dealt with *The Metaphysical Theory of the State*, with *The Rational Good as the End of Human Action*, and with *The Elements of Social Justice*. In the present volume he sets himself to examine the actual conditions underlying social life and the way in which they subserve the rational ends of society. Those who are acquainted with Professor Hobhouse's work thus far will not need to be told that this new volume is a most illuminating and important contribution to the subject. It begins with a discussion of the general scope and meaning of community life, and then goes on to describe the varied conditions of social development—environmental, biological, psychological, and social proper. This is followed by an examination of the mental factors in social evolution and a discussion of the sense in which any common will in the process can be distinguished. Then comes a comparison of the development of thought with that of social organization, treated under the headings of Ethics and Religion, and leading to an examination of various fundamental social institutions. Finally we have the contention that a scientific view of society reveals the action of the human will in producing social change and intelligent co-operation among human beings as the sole cause of progress, the whole being regarded as a phase in the cosmic process of the development of mind gradually subduing to its own ends the conditions which it can use but cannot abolish.

This rough sketch of the contents of the book gives very little idea of the wealth of material which it contains. Every possible factor in the complex connexion of progress with social development is brought under consideration, and each is given its full weight in contributing to the general advance. In spite, however, of the great complexity and variety of his subject, Professor Hobhouse never loses his way, but proceeds always with a sure tread. He marshals his materials so skilfully and writes so clearly that even he who runs may read.

We are specially interested in his treatment of religion—and this occasions the only criticism to which the book seems open. That Professor Hobhouse quite clearly recognizes that religion is not an unimportant factor in human social development is evident from such a passage as: "By religion I understand the spiritual bond, that is to say, the interdependence which relates every element in the life of the mind to the whole. This interdependence, like other relations, is felt and acted upon before it is apprehended, and it is apprehended in rudiments and fragments before it is apprehended as a whole and in its truth." These rudiments are outlined in the early phases of thought and life, and from this Professor Hobhouse goes on to indicate the various forms of the ethico-religious advance, but treats it too much in isolation from the general process which he is describing. He gives little or no notice of the various theories which other sociologists have put forward as to the place of religion in the life of peoples both of the lower and the higher culture. Naturally enough his emphasis is on other factors, but we cannot avoid the suspicion that he has rather minimized one of the most important.

The study of sociology and of the social implications of religion, especially with reference to Christianity, is assuming a new importance in these days, and it is to be hoped that it will occupy far more of the attention of the leaders of the Christian Church in the future. If this is to take place with any real advantage it cannot be based on merely senti-

mental considerations, but on a thorough and scientific acquaintance with the whole subject of man's social development. Those who wish to undertake such a study could find no better guide than Professor Hobhouse, and it is to be hoped that this last book in particular will be very widely read.

W. B. Selbie.

Psychology and Primitive Culture. By F. C. Bartlett. Cambridge University Press. 8s. 6d.

Health and Conduct. By A. J. Brock, M.D. Williams & Norgate. 10s. 6d.

Psycho-Analysis and Everyman. By D. N. Barbour. Allen & Unwin. 6s.

These three books have this much in common, viz., that they apply psychological methods to various aspects of human life and behaviour. Mr. Bartlett's study of the psychology of primitive culture is a very full and valuable treatment of the subject. He deals with it definitely from the standpoint that the underlying psychological mechanisms are the same in all stages of social development, and it may therefore be regarded as a fitting introduction to a much wider theme. He begins by examining those psychological principles which are useful and necessary in approaching the study of man's social life and behaviour. On this follows the main part of the book, in which he applies these principles to the social reactions and the folk-lore of primitive peoples. The book concludes with some very pertinent suggestions as to the way in which the psychological method and principles must be modified in passing from the study of the primitive to that of modern civilization. The anthropological investigation into the life of savage and primitive peoples during the last half-century has provided an enormous mass of material for the kind of work which Mr. Bartlett seeks to do. He has made full use of this, and throughout his book he keeps very close to ascertained facts. His treatment is strictly scientific, and the general impression which his book produces is that in the methods of modern psychological study we have a most valuable instrument for sociological research. The tendency at present is no doubt to exaggerate its importance, but in the hands of a trained psychologist like Mr. Bartlett this tendency is reduced to a minimum. If anything, he is somewhat over-cautious in stating his conclusions, but that does not lessen the value of his most fascinating and illuminating inquiry.

Dr. Brock is a medical man, a psychologist, a sociologist, and a man of the world, and his book on *Health and Conduct* shows him to be equally efficient and instructive in any one of these capacities. His patient is modern society, and he diagnoses the state of the patient under pre-war conditions, under the stress of the war, and in its post-war exhaustion. His analysis is acute and penetrating, and he has much good advice to give to those who are concerned with the evils of our present state. Among his more general conclusions we may note his insistence on the fact that human life must be regarded as a whole, and his antagonism to all modern attempts to centralize, departmentalize, and dehumanize the treatment of social and physical ills. He strongly advocates the proper regional survey of social and physical conditions, and in the treatment of them he believes that the general practitioner should take precedence of the specialist. He is also convinced of the power of mind over matter and of the necessity now laid upon doctors to look at their work from the psychological as well as from the merely physiological point of view. He argues that " psychotherapy represents to some extent a reaction and a

recognition by the medical profession of its central co-ordinating function. In so far as psychotherapy stands for a revitalization of the medical profession, then it may well be expected in the future to prove effective in helping the public back to that self-confidence which they so eminently lack." At the same time he strongly insists that psychology is not simply a new science by itself, but has to be related to all the other sciences, and particularly to sociology. Much of what he says is addressed to doctors, and they will be all the better for considering it; but his book also strongly appeals to laymen, and his contentions are so well backed by historical parallels that they also can read it with the utmost advantage. Dr. Brock thus states the conclusion of the matter: "Civilized man seeks surcease from his troubles in more life and fuller. The closer he identifies himself with the life about him the nearer he will come to the goal of his striving. So at length he will find his point of contact with that Great Life that some call God."

In *Psycho-Analysis and Everyman* Mr. Barbour seeks to introduce the methods and conclusions of the New Psychology to the man and woman in the street. He gives a clear and complete description of the whole subject, dealing with it mainly from the standpoint of Freud, Jung, and Adler. In an appendix he discusses Miss Macaulay's *Dangerous Ages* from this point of view, and makes of it a very interesting illustration of his main theses. Like most exponents of the New Psychology, however, he is dreadfully obsessed by the sex element, and does not always distinguish between the normal and the abnormal in its manifestations. He is careful to try and defend himself against any such criticism, but he has left one reader at least unconvinced.

W. B. Selbie.

Jesus Christ in the Light of Psychology. By G. Stanley Hall. New York: Appleton. $7.50.

This is a truly amazing book, but to those who know Dr. Stanley Hall's previous work not altogether unexpected. It was quite natural that he should apply his psychological method to the study of the life and person of Jesus Christ. The experiment is legitimate enough, and might reasonably be expected to throw a good deal of new light on the subject. This Dr. Hall has certainly done, but he has overdone it. He writes, as he always does, in a loose, voluminous style, with abundance of technical jargon, but with real learning and genuine enthusiasm for his subject. But the net result of it all is a monumental example of the perils of a one-sided method and mentality. When will our psychologists learn that psychology is a good servant but a bad master, and that it does not by itself provide a solution of all problems, including those which centre round the Person of Christ and the history of Christianity?

Let it be said at once that Dr. Hall has a real reverence for Jesus Christ and a deep appreciation of the value of Christianity. But he symbolizes it all and regards it from so purely subjective a viewpoint as almost to deprive it of reality. At the same time he confesses that the result of his psychological study has been a genuine renewal of religion in his own personal life. "As a result of all this I now read the Gospels with a new insight and a new delight. I believe I can now even repeat all the clauses of the Apostles Creed with a fervid sentiment of conviction. My intellectual interpretation of the meaning of each item of it probably differs *toto cælo* from that of the average orthodox believer. To me not a miracle in the one nor a clause in the other is true in a crass literal material sense, but they are true in a sense far higher which is only symbolized on

ne literal plane." In consequence he has no use for the merely negative ork of the critics. He believes it possible to find still higher interpretations f what Christianity is and can accomplish for the human soul and for the orld, and to this end he dedicates his work.

The book begins with a study of Jesus's physical personality, in which here is much that is very interesting but more that is irrelevant. The utcome of it is to resolve Jesus into a " polymorphic category of the ideal." his is followed by a long chapter on " Jesus in Literature," in which all ne various interpretations of His life and theories of His person are passed nder review. They are described with impressive fulness and learning nd subjected to keen and caustic criticism, and the result is stated as llows : " Thus Jesus incorporates all the good tendencies in man. He is ne embodiment of all his resistances to evil through the ages. In the ontemplation of His character, achievements, and teachings man remembers is better, unfallen self, and by seeing the true ideal of the race incarnated ven the most formal recognition of this enfleshed ideal does something o evoke power to resist evil within and without, and gives some incentive o reapproximate his unfallen self, and indeed may start subliminal agencies nat will issue in a regenerate life, bring a new sense of duty, a new passion or service, and give man a new self-reverence, self-knowledge and self-con-rol. All these things together constitute the true psychological essence of hristianity. Here lie its depth, mystery, and wonder. If pragmatic is igher than either historic or theoretic certainty and reality, we have ere the very truth of truth."

The remaining chapters of the book deal with the birth, teaching, nessiahship, eschatology, parables, and miracles of Jesus. The method s the same throughout—to bring out the underlying psychology of the hole story and to present it afresh from a purely subjective point of view. uch that seems to us essential is explained away, and the general treat-nent is as arbitrary and one-sided as some of those negative presentations f Jesus which Dr. Hall so roundly condemns. In spite of his wide cquaintance with the literature of the subject, and in spite of the sincerity f his own experimental reading of the life and work of Christ, we cannot ut feel that the picture he presents is unbalanced and out of proportion. t may be psychological, but it is psychology run to seed, and it needs o be corrected and filled out by history on the one hand and by theology n the other before it can be regarded as true either to fact or to experience.

W. B. Selbie.

owards a Christian Sociology. By A. J. Penty. Allen & Unwin. 6s.

abour and the Industrial Revolution. By E. C. Fairchild. Allen & Unwin. 3s. 6d.

hrist and Labour. By C. F. Andrews. Student Christian Movement. 4s.

Not the least merit of Mr. Penty's well-written volume is the assumption hat we have a Social Gospel. Dr. Headlam recently denied that there vas a Christian Sociology, and Dr. Barnes that the Kingdom of God was ossible on this side of the grave ; over against this, social theorists of lmost every school indict the Church because she is either too timid or oo faithless to preach and apply her social Gospel—Professor Hoernle has rgued that the profound reaction to official Christianity is due to the idespread feeling that it has failed to solve the problems of communities.

Such a book as this is therefore to be welcomed as an attempt to relate the Gospel to the economic and industrial problems of our day.

The book has other merits. There are very interesting and suggestive chapters on the social organization of the Middle Ages and the influence of Roman law on economic structure. It is emphasized that our economic problems are problems of currency, and not of property; it was the former and not the latter which "brought into existence the problem of Capitalism," with its consequent class divisions of society. On Mr. Penty's theory the price of articles should not be subject to the fluctuations of supply and demand. A just and fixed price would stabilize currency and free the farmer, the craftsman and everyone "from the uncertainty and anxiety which to-day are undermining the very morale of production." Currency and machinery lie at the root of our modern economic and industrial problems. Mr. Penty's solution is to bring back the system of the Guilds, which would fix the just price and determine the limits of production. He also advises the revival of agriculture and the crafts—these would need protection. Emigration on a large scale is necessary.

In spite of its suggestiveness and its emphasis on spiritual values, it is doubtful whether the author has put forward any permanent remedy. The return to small-scale production and the break-up of industrialism are not so imminent as Mr. Penty imagines. The root of our troubles, as he sees, lies in the personal profit motive underlying industrialism. With that the Gospel must deal, but it is doubtful whether the Social Gospel can be used to justify any particular type of social structure, least of all a return to the Guilds. The Guilds failed owing to their tendency to form hereditary monopolies; progress was initiated outside of them; vocational organization is just as repressive and reactionary as any other kind, as Graham Wallas has pointed out. Mr. Penty's failure to suggest a likely remedy for our social disease does not, however, minimize the value of his diagnosis.

Mr. Fairchild never argues his case, but traces in a peculiarly passionless manner how labour, as such, fared at the hands of capital and the governing classes from 1760 to 1832. His book grips all the way through. He gives a concise and accurate account of the conditions regarding parliamentary power, rural organization, etc., in 1760. Inventions, the consequent increase of production, the necessary canal construction and increase of markets are all related to the concomitant conditions in which labour had to live and work. The chief theories of Petty, Adam Smith and Ricardo are contrasted, and we can draw the inevitable inferences. Elementary education, the rise of Trade Unions, and the struggle for economic and political justice are all treated and related to labour.

Mr. Andrews's book is written in an agony of spirit. Conscious, perhaps too conscious, of the poverty and degradation existing in Europe since the Industrial Revolution, the author warns India especially against a repetition of these conditions. He seems to feel that these evils are inevitable consequences of industrial expansion. They are the inevitable consequence of an industrialism that is consciously or unconsciously dominated by the personal profit motive. But is not this innate motive capable of sublimation? Must we go back to Mediævalism before the motive can be transformed? Be that as it may, no one will read this book without feeling that Labour is a spiritual and ethical value, and to subordinate it to economic motives is unchristian. They are both books to read.

JOHN G. MCKENZIE.

ntroduction to the Old Testament. By Dr. E. Sellin. Hodder. 10s. 6d.

For the appearance of this very important book in English dress ve are indebted to the initiative of Professor Peake and the enterprise of he publishers, who, it goes without saying, were fortunate in securing he co-operation of Mr. Montgomery, the well-known translator of Dr. chweitzer's critical classics. This English version represents Professor ellin's latest views, the last German edition having been revised for the urpose of the translation.

The conclusions reached challenge, in many cases, judgments which had ome to be very widely held. Nevertheless, the freshness, originality, and ndependence shown by the author, combined with his undoubted eminence s a scholar, make it necessary that due consideration should be given to vhat he urges.

In one respect, at all events, we must admit that Professor Sellin offers valuable corrective to what had become an unconscious tendency. He rgues that the Graf-Wellhausen-Kuenen school took too little account f the great, ancient, and highly developed civilizations of Egypt and of Babylonia, that it also failed to grasp the importance of archæological vork such as that carried out at Gezer and Taanach, and that thus it treated Old Testament religion as if this had originated *in vacuo*, Melchizedek-wise, nd the Old Testament itself as if the surviving portions of the Hebrew iterature comprised practically all which had ever been written. Both f these pre-suppositions were, in so far as they existed, quite without oundation. Hebrew literature was a body of writing very much larger han its extant portions, and the Hebrew civilization had its roots, both lirectly and through the old Canaanite culture, in those of Egypt and of Babylonia. We must admit that the criticism is largely valid. But we re not so certain that Professor Sellin is equally happy in what he attempts o build on it. He considers, it seems, that the Graf-Wellhausen school uffered from a sort of "post-exilic complex", and that its late dating of, or example, the decalogue, the book of the covenant, the tabernacle stories, nd the bulk of the psalms, is due to its undue emphasis on the primitive nature of early Hebrew culture. Whilst admitting the correctness of the generally accepted analysis of the Pentateuch, he thinks that P is "an exilic revision of a pre-exilic historical book" (p. 86), and argues for the essential historicity of the desert tabernacle and the whole Aaronic tradiion, including the Mosaic authorship of the decalogue and the book of he covenant. The term "sons of Aaron" is, he thinks, "much earlier nd more comprehensive" than the phrase "sons of Zadok".

Thus do extremes meet. For Dr. Cowley, who appears to regard the vhole Aaronic story as a tendence-myth, yet suggests (*Aramaic Papyri*, op. xxv-xxvii) that P was a Hebrew translation of documents which had previously existed for centuries in cuneiform Babylonian as the esoteric property of the priesthood. Professor Sellin backs up his opinion, which s a general hypothesis, not an isolated conclusion, in a most thorough manner. He has convinced himself that the tent of the covenant existed at Gibeon right into the time of Solomon, and makes light of the difficulty raised by the fact that the ark was undoubtedly, in that case, separated rom it for centuries, first at Shiloh, then at Jerusalem, which seems to us a fatal objection to his theory. Besides, the very existence of the tent at Gibeon is based on three or four references to that place, in only two of vhich (both in *Chronicles*) is the tent mentioned, whilst another requires emendation—textually without any authorization—of Gihon to Gibeon. On the same lines our author, carrying the sources of J and E far into

the later historical books, tries to demonstrate that Judah possessed from an early period a trilogy of shrines at Gibeon, Mizpah, and Jerusalem. That Mizpah was the seat of government under Gedaliah and later under the Persians is of course well known. But this fact furnishes no real support for Dr. Sellin's Gibeon-Mizpah-Zion theory, which seems to us otherwise unconvincing.

Following out this general tendency, we find that the song of Hannah is declared to be pre-exilic, in spite of its obvious likeness to the Magnificat. Dr. Sellin seems to have missed the work of the late Professor Aytoun on the latter ode (*JTS*, July, 1917). More surprising still is the attribution of 2 Sam. 22 and 23^{1-7} to David himself. After this we are less startled to find that most of the passages in the books of Samuel which we have been accustomed to regard as late D interpolations are to be attributed to E and go back to the Elijah-Elisha period, or to read of Hosea that "the chief of sins is for him the whole cultus of his own time", nor to find that the "restoration passage" (Amos 9^{11-15}) is given back to us as a genuine utterance of the prophet. But our author betrays the cloven (or is it the uncloven?) hoof of tendency when he exclaims (p. 120) that "after all the God of History has set his seal upon the view taken in this Mizpah source". "This Mizpah source" is, of course, the document containing the later theological account which condemned the establishment of the kingdom under Saul and headed toward a pure theocracy.

Dr. Sellin believes that eschatological expectancy was a burning hope centuries before the 2nd Isaiah (p. 142). This is at any rate a valuable caution, and we shall do well to take full account of the possibilities which it suggests. At the same time we cannot help feeling that our author is not dealing with history in a fully unbiased manner. As we proceed we find ourselves successfully anticipating the general lines on which he will expound any given book, and his expositions are always in the ultimate interests of conservatism. For example, he makes it quite clear that he regards the basis of Ruth as historical—this may well be so. But why should the tendence nature of the book be whittled down by the entirely unconvincing argument that it must be dated earlier than Nehemiah because the expectation of a continued Davidic kingship is involved—which would have been impossible after the fall of Zerubbabel? The point has no cogency whatever. The expectation that the Davidic kingship would be continued was part of the nationalist apocalyptic of the Jews, and was largely unaffected by the temporary suspension of the kingdom's outward functioning. Compare the doctrines of the hidden imām in Persia and the hidden mahdi in the Sudan.

We must also accuse Dr. Sellin of disregarding the work of English and American scholars. Mr. Aytoun has been mentioned. But there are even more serious omissions. The Gadd tablet is utterly neglected, and the fall of Nineveh dated in 606 (p. 180), whilst the late dating of Ezra, demonstrated by Torrey and Batten, and fully accepted by such a notable authority as our own Canon Box, is simply ignored.

The quite unproved theory of Dr. Sellin that the original ephod, e.g. that used for divining by Abiathar, was a priestly garment, is made the basis for a whole inverted pyramid of argument, though to our mind Judg. 17^{5} *alone* is sufficient to make this basic assumption very doubtful. Of course our author is at pains to explain Judg. 17–18 in a sense favourable to his own views, as one would expect.

There are many extremely valuable points in the book. Among them is the theory that the suffering servant in 2nd Isaiah is—not Jehoiachin, Zerubbabel, or Jeremiah—but Moses, that Moses actually died a martyr's

eath, and that the correct tradition is here preserved for us. The fact hat the servant seems to have been a leper (Isa. 52^{14}) and that we have a imilar tradition about Moses (Ex. 4^{6}), together with the expectation of both Ioses and Elijah *redivivi* which certainly existed (Deut. 18^{15}, Malachi 4^{4-6}, Iark 9^{4}), would seem to afford further grounds for this interesting view. t is hoped that enough has been said to show that so challenging nd thorough a work by one who is both entirely modern in his criticism nd profound in his scholarship should be read and pondered carefully by ll who are in earnest about the Old Testament.

Professor Peake has added an invaluable bibliography of English uthorities.

J. P. Naish.

eremiah. By Sir George Adam Smith. Hodder. 10s. 6d.

Even those who are in nowise addicted *jurare in verba magistri* will feel rateful to Sir G. A. Smith for this thorough and delightful piece of work. t is a great pity that it could not have been issued in a more adequate form, uch, for example, as that of his *Schweich Lectures*. One cannot help feeling hat paper, binding and general get-up are unworthy of both the matter nd the master—they suggest a book of comparatively superficial alue.

The veteran scholar has arranged in chronological order and re-translated ost of those portions of our present O.T. book which he considers to be he genuine utterances of Jeremiah himself. His re-translations, which eproduce in a remarkable manner the peculiar Semitic *tang* of the original yrics, form one of the most valuable features of the work. He leans strongly n the LXX, but has also made full use of the Targūms (an important oint) and the Syriac—less, apparently, of the Vulgate. Lack of space orbids quotation, and it must suffice to say that his re-constructions are enerally justifiable and never unduly forced, whilst in many cases he ubstitutes simple and beautiful metrical versions for the obscure and mpossible prose renderings of the A.V. and the R.V., which in the past ave succeeded to a very large extent in concealing from our view the oetic form and quality of most of the oracles.

The critical position adopted is firm, yet moderate. It is obvious to very reader of the Hebrew text that many portions of the book are exilic r post-exilic, exhibiting plainly the ideas, style and vocabulary typical f D. In accordance both with this evidence and with the additional itness furnished by the wide divergences and omissions of the LXX text, ir G. A. Smith derives both Mass. and Greek from earlier and differing Iebrew collections. These themselves included much matter which, in ddition to the original historical work of Baruch, had been added during everal generations to the roll traditionally attributed to Jeremiah. assages, he declares, which presuppose an exilic or post-exilic environ- ent must be ruled out.

On the whole, the interpretation, both of Jeremiah's message and per- onality, and of Israelite history in general, is conservative in a broad sense ather than radical. He concludes that the prophetic visions were actual hysical facts, not *ecstatic* and subjective experiences, thus declining to upport the view advocated by Professor Hölscher and Dr. T. H. Robinson. n the same line he maintains stoutly that Jeremiah could have regarded, nd as a matter of fact did regard, himself as a prophet to the nations in eneral, not only to Israel.

Historically it is laid down as certain that for four hundred years pre-

vious to 600 B.C. " no deity of the land had been worshipped (in Jerusalem) save Yahweh, and He in no material form " (p. 76). In face of such passages as 2 Kings 21^{3-7} and Jer. 44^{17}, not to speak of the evidence of the Elephantiné papyri, such a dogmatic assertion seems hardly justifiable. We should be interested also to see the evidence for the statement that Nebuchadrezzar imposed Babylonian idolatry on Jerusalem (p. 234). Account is carefully taken of the new " Gadd " tablet, but the author had only been able to see a newspaper report of Mr. Gadd's descriptive lecture before publishing his book.

Dr. Smith refuses, as it will seem to most of us rightly, to reject any passages on the ground of pre-conceived theories about the prophet's personality. Accordingly, several important sections discarded by such authorities as Duhm, Cornill, and Skinner are here restored.

It is extremely refreshing to find a modern scholar of such eminence quoting Calvin freely, and very much to the point too. We are reminded of the healthy atmosphere of Reformation theology which surrounds the opening chapters of the OTJC. Calvin's comment on Jeremiah's evasion of the truth in his reply to the Jewish nobles is excellently good. In dealing with the prophet's advice to his people to surrender to and serve the foreigner, Sir George shows himself a gallant and canny Scot as well as a hardy expositor. Duhm and Cornill, as good Treitschkeians, had cut the knot by rejecting the passage on the ground that a Hebrew prophet could never have been a traitor. Not so our author. The passage is retained, and Jeremiah is vindicated with one hand, whilst modern pacificists are slain, kindly but firmly, with the other. It is a neat piece of work, and we can hardly refrain from a cheer as the doughty champion alike of nationalism and of Jeremiah emerges unscathed from his dilemma. The best things in the book, after the translations themselves, are the extraordinarily profound and trenchant discussions, firstly of predestination in the O.T. sense—shown to be very different from the predestination of Augustine and Calvin—and, secondly, of the difference between Jeremiah's prophetic utterances and the contradictory oracles given by his, doubtless sincere, opponents (pp. 336ff and 260ff).

There are those who will regret that Sir George did not sometimes supply us with the emended Hebrew text underlying his translations. Doubtless the reason was an economic one. Or has he deliberately declined thus to pander to a purely exotic and linguistic taste? We are grateful in any case for such a fine and penetrating piece of work from one who has long been numbered amongst *i maestri di lor che sanno* in the field of O.T. studies.

J. P. NAISH.

The Speaker's Bible. Edited by JAMES HASTINGS, D.D. The Gospel according to Luke, Vol. II. *Speaker's Bible* Offices, Aberdeen. 12s. 6d.

The first volume was noticed in the issue for October 1923. This one covers the Gospel from 8^{18} to 15^{12}, and completes the material left by Dr. Hastings on Luke's Gospel. Dr. Hastings had a diviner's rod for sound and helpful exposition, and many waters have gushed forth to fill the reservoir of 444 double-columned closely-printed pages. We notice a good many references to Papini's *Story of Christ* in the first half of the book, but poets, preachers, essayists, biographers are all pressed into the service. Revs. J. Robertson Cameron and A. J. Gossip contribute signed articles, the latter dealing with " Eternal Life." Among the more

xtended papers are studies on Hatred, Hypocrisy, Waste, Self-Love and ıe Loneliness of Christ. The Bibliographical Index should be very useful; runs to 36 pages.

A. J. GRIEVE.

he Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem: Its Purpose in the Light of the Synoptic Gospels. By WILLIAM HEALEY CADMAN, B.Litt., B.D., D.Th. Oxford Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.

This book, by the Tutor in N.T. Greek at Mansfield College, is a sure ɔken that the Mansfield tradition is being maintained. Few colleges of ny denomination can put into the field a trio of New Testament scholars ke Dr. Bartlet, Mr. Dodd and Dr. Cadman. The present work is much ıore than its title implies, and in its range becomes largely a study of the hole public life of Jesus. In his endeavour to focus the inquiry on the oint selected as central Dr. Cadman covers a great deal of the synoptic arrative, and his treatment results in a very illuminating commentary on ıuch of the synoptic record. His thesis is that from first to last Jesus imed at inducing repentance as the preparation for the coming kingdom. ı Galilee He came into acute conflict with those who considered He was ndermining the Torah. These officials united with Herod Antipas, "to hom an eschatological movement was a source of danger," and Jesus as obliged to leave Galilee. Our author puts a great deal of stress on uke 13^{31-33}, and I think succeeds in getting the Marcan narrative into line ith it. Jesus resolved to use the Passover in Jerusalem to preach repent-ıce, but came to realize that He could not attain the end of His mission part from death. He did not go to Jerusalem as a suffering Messiah, ut "desired to die on the issue of His message about the nearness of the ingdom and the sufficiency and yet the necessity of repentance."

The argument is marshalled from step to step with great skill and no pparent violence. It is fortified by wide reading—no less of periodicals ıan of books—and altogether displays a Teutonic thoroughness, with o sacrifice of lucidity.

A. J. GRIEVE.

ew Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's. By A. H. MCNEILE, D.D. Cambridge University Press. 10s.

Dr. McNeile has already given us a study of the Pauline epistles, and ı the present book he completes a "New Testament Theology" by ealing with the teaching of the non-Pauline books of the Canon. The eaching of Paul is treated as a norm, by reference to which the develop-ıent of Christian thought in the New Testament may be measured. The ethod is sound. Paul's is the first attempt known to us to state the hristian position with anything approaching definition, and we have ufficient of his work to be able to form a relatively complete idea of hristianity as he understood it. Thus we obtain something like a fixed frame of reference" for the observation of the movement of thought that period of extraordinarily rapid development. The constant reference) the Pauline "datum-line" does help towards precision in estimating ıe contribution of the various writings. Thus, to take an example, the eatment of the First Epistle of Peter brings out very clearly the enormous fference between its standpoint and that of Paul, in spite of obvious auline influence. The usual relegation of this writing to the class of deutero-Pauline" literature has done much to obscure the relations of fferent types of early Christian thought and experience. Dr. McNeile

is surely right in recognizing in it a conception of Christianity essentially primitive and non-Pauline, brought into contact with Pauline categories. Similarly, the Pauline element in the Fourth Gospel has perhaps been exaggerated in some quarters, and Dr. McNeile seems to hold the balance fairly between the Pauline elements in Johannine Christianity and the very striking and important elements which are entirely alien from Paul's view of life and the world. The book is a valuable presentation of its subject in the light of the most recent knowledge and of the author's well-known accurate scholarship and sound judgment.

C. H. DODD.

The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul. By ADOLF DEISSMANN. Translated by WILLIAM E. WILSON. Hodder. 7s. 6d.

This is a very beautiful book, and a most Christian one. If anyone is disposed to fear that the analytical criticism of the present day somehow disintegrates the New Testament, or reduces its religious value, he should be referred to these Selly Oak lectures. Here is the ripe product of scholarship quickened all through by the touch of a fine Christian feeling and clarified by deep religious insight. To those who are familiar with earlier works of the author there will be little that in the formal sense is new, though material is used which is not elsewhere accessible in English being from the new German edition of *Light from the Ancient East.* But it presents with admirable force and conciseness the outcome of his labours in detail, and serves as an illuminating statement of the central values of New Testament Christianity as they emerge from a truly historical study.

The book falls rather sharply into two parts, for the two courses of lectures are independent. The first course traces, with all the reverent reserve that conscientious scholarship must needs show in this region, the inner life of Jesus Christ—His prayer, His communion with God as Father and Lord—and shows how this communion inspired the "good tidings" of the Kingdom of God, and culminated in the consciousness of a Messianic mission. "The originality of Jesus," the author concludes, "lies in His whole personality, in the peculiar energy of His experience of the living God. . . . The peculiar thing is not that there were to be found on His string of pearls twelve or twenty of such size as had never before been seen, but that in the treasure-chamber of the religions of mankind there is this one diamond, which sheds forth rays of such unexampled fire and purity."

The same general attitude of mind controls the second course, which deals with Paul's communion with Christ as the centre from which all his activity and teaching must be understood. There is an illuminating discussion of the sense in which Paul is to be described as a mystic. He was, says Dr. Deissmann, not an "acting mystic," who "by his own action endeavours to produce the divine reaction" (like a howling dervish), but a "reacting mystic," who "reacts in response to the action of God;" and at the same time his "reacting mysticism" was "united with a practical ethic of unparalleled intensity." Its formula is "faith working by love," and its religious symbol is the characteristic Pauline phrase "in Christ Jesus." "The spiritual environment of the Pauline Passion mysticism and of Paul's mysticism in general, is not the modern Western scholar's study, but the open air and light of the holy East, and its source is not the intellect concerned in formulating a thesis and propounding midnight hypotheses at its study table, but a prophetic mind trembling in the presence of God."

We should have been glad of an additional chapter in which the author might have brought together the two parts of his subject, and shown us explicitly the relation between the religion of Jesus and the faith of Paul. As it is, he has left the reader to find out for himself the answer to one of the difficult problems of early Christianity. But he has not left him without materials for an answer.

C. H. DODD.

Theism and Thought: A Study in Familiar Beliefs. GIFFORD LECTURES (Glasgow, 1922–23). By ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR, EARL OF BALFOUR, K.G., O.M., etc. Hodder. 15s.

More than a generation has passed since Mr. Arthur Balfour, as he then was, began his literary career with a *Plea for Philosophic Doubt*, which he followed up shortly with a more positive statement of *Foundations of Belief*. The most interesting question raised by these Gifford Lectures is how far the new plea for theism modifies or improves upon these earlier discussions.

The *Foundations of Belief* contained four parts. The first dealt with "Some Consequences of Belief"—rather, as one has said, of "disbelief." Briefly, Naturalism kills hope. If we cannot hold to beauty, truth, and goodness, life is meaningless. Part II—"Some Reasons for Belief"—dismisses all the leading types of philosophy as unsatisfactory. Their high endeavour fails. Part III—"Some Causes of Belief"—appears to be the centre of the whole discussion. It argues that our mental faculties possess survival value, but contain in themselves no guarantee of our power to attain abstract truth; yet—the assumption slips in—*in essence we do attain it*. Part IV formulates "Suggestions Towards a Provisional Philosophy." If we will allow the author to postulate an overruling God, we will be able to acount for the fact that blind and non-rational processes lead to rational results. The argument yokes side by side what Kant would call Scepticism and what he would call Dogmatism. It does not seek to distil faith out of mere scepticism with the school of Mallock. The strain of thought is subtler and more intricate. In some respects, though so much more artful, it recalls the old Design argument, which might be bluntly summarized as follows: Matter has no affinity with purpose; Life is full of purposeful adaptations; God must have forced purpose upon blind, deaf, dead matter.

Part I of the *Foundations* served as an additional buttress, perhaps, to Mr. Balfour's argument, but hardly as an essential feature. Since those years the conception of value has come to the front, and the Gifford Lectures appeal to values where the *Foundations* spoke rather of the intolerable meagreness of Naturalism. In a sense, the buttress is being incorporated in the foundations. But when the second series of lectures turns from beauty and goodness to speak principally of "Theism and *Thought*," we are thrust back upon the same strange vision of God overruling the irrational until it serves rational ends. Much of the book is occupied in demonstrating that recent philosophies—mainly, it is true, recent forms of naturalism—are no more watertight than the works of older thinkers. The lecturer now explains[1] that he harps continually upon natural selection, not because it is the only or even the most probable theory of evolution, but because it is the one alternative to conscious purpose as an explanation of design. Is that certain? Difficult as may be the conception of a blind *élan vital*, it will be necessary for philosophy to explore the possibilities

[1] *Theism and Humanism*, 260 *n.*; *Theism and Thought*, 24 *n.*

of such a *tertium quid*—of something which is more than accident and less than intervening wisdom.

Again, many students of philosophy will repel the whole assumption that rational "beliefs" are to be explained (surely naturalistically!) out of "causes." If nature, or if God, premiates intelligence on the ground of its survival value, nature or God must face the consequences of having advanced evolution to a point where the beast will inevitably become the man, where reason will have its chance, where the values will emerge. It ceases to be even plausible to treat reality (at any stage of growth) as a mere sequence of phenomenal happenings; and yet so to treat it (at all stages) is one half of Lord Balfour's foundations. Early or late, he defends the same elegant but unfruitful paradox. Needless to add that he defends it deftly, and while doing so exhibits fine personal sympathies.

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

The Significance of Life; A Short Study in Theism. By ERNEST F. THOMPSON. Swarthmore Press. 2s.

The writer has emerged from doubt into faith, and states his grounds of belief for the help of others. He does not aspire to demonstration, but the pleas he formulates are wholesome and impressive. While he disclaims technical Christian orthodoxy, he suggests to one's mind the saying "He that is not against us is for us." Principal Graham writes an introduction.

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

The Church which is His Body. By HENRY HOWARD. Epworth Press. 6s.

This "Fernley Lecture" is an example of the type of religious literature of which Professor Henry Drummond is still the classic exponent. Mr. Howard brings to his task a mind well equipped with biological knowledge and theological insight and a happy and vigorous style. The result is a work eminently stimulating and suggestive. Preachers who love to use scientific facts and theories as illustrative of religious truths will find it a mine of material for their purpose, and the general reader will be enriched both scientifically and religiously by its study. From the standpoint of serious thought, however, it is doubtful whether it throws any fresh light on the mysteries of the Faith. The "argument from analogy" is always full of traps for the unwary: even in this book we are often left in doubt whether the author is seeking to assimilate spiritual things to things biological, and attempting to "explain" the higher order in terms of the lower; or whether he is endeavouring to show that the higher is a natural development or extension of the lower into the realm of spiritual realities; or whether he is simply trying to illustrate the "prophetic" character of many physical and biological facts and laws which find their fullest realization in the spiritual realm. Possibly the writer would accept none of these alternative interpretations of his purpose, and say that his aim is simply to bring forward a series of suggestive analogies between two worlds that are not capable of being seriously subsumed under an identical system of laws and principles. From a "methodological" point of view, and for her own strictly limited purposes, science may be justified in her passionate desire to reduce her categories of reality to the simplest possible form in trying to "explain" the higher in terms of the lower, which means in the end that "reality" is reduced to a mathematical formula of the Einstein type. The religious instinct demands quite another method of explanation, finding the lower order explicable only in terms of the highest

tegories of the spirit. There will always be more or less tension between ese two methods of handling reality. Fundamentally Mr. Howard, of urse, belongs to the latter type of thinker, but it would sometimes be ell if he made this clearer in his exposition of various themes. Apart om this occasional ambiguity, and read with discrimination, the book valuable both for personal religious stimulus and as a rich storehouse homiletical material, and it should find a place in every preacher's brary.

E. Griffith-Jones.

he Spirit in the New Testament. By Ernest F. Scott, D.D. Hodder. 7s. 6d.

By this book Dr. Scott has added greatly to the debt we already owe im. It is a careful study of a very important and somewhat difficult ubject. We cannot in a brief notice give any adequate idea of the horoughness and comprehensiveness of the treatment, tracing, as it does, hen's thoughts of the Spirit from the earliest dawn to the latest writings f the New Testament, and then the later development, decay and revival f the doctrine. The book can be confidently recommended to all who ish to see the Biblical references to the Spirit critically examined and luminated. A cardinal principle with Dr. Scott is that all we have con- erning the Spirit is based on experience, that there was always some eality underlying what is said, in whatever way it may have been appre- ended and expressed. It is this fact that gives us in the Spirit something eal, living, and of permanent value.

The treatment of Paul's doctrine of the Spirit is very full and able. But was not the Spirit, with Paul, always that of God, quite distinct even rom the "living Christ"? It was the Spirit that dwelt in Christ and in s fullness proceeded from Christ, but always the Spirit of our Father. The Spirit was not yet personal; this was reached through assimilation with he Logos, leading on, later, to the Trinity. Dr. Scott remarks that it is he doctrine of the Spirit that has brought us through recent changes, and n a valuable concluding chapter and summary, he says, *inter alia*, that t is the Spirit that makes Christianity an ever-living, progressive religion, nd is the ultimate witness to the truth of the Gospel amidst all discussion f externals. "It is present in all good men, and in all impulses that nake for a higher and nobler life." It is in the thought of the Spirit that he world will find the free and universal religion it is seeking. The Spirit as been working in all the movements of history towards larger freedom, visdom and righteousness; it gives meaning to the life of humanity; all our hopes depend on it, and in the mind of Christ we have the mind of he Spirit. But ought we not, therefore, to hold that the Spirit *is* God s He is with men, and that, ethically viewed, as it must be, its essence s the Love that God *is*, moving in human hearts—the Spirit of "thy Father which is in secret"?

No serious student of Christianity or of religion should miss this book.

W. L. Walker.

The Holy Spirit and the Church. By Charles Gore, D.D. Murray. 7s. 6d.

This is the third and last of Dr. Gore's "Reconstruction" series. It s an earnest and able book, written in a beautiful spirit, with the aim of helping to uplift the world by leading men to what the author believes o be the saving Christian faith. The *Church* is its subject rather than

the Spirit. While very full of matter, it is pleasant to read, and will be profitable for either lay or cleric.

Up to a certain length most Christians will gladly go with Dr. Gore but there will be places where many will have to call a halt. Dr. Gore's views, as an Anglican leader, are well known, and he has given us them here in their most attractive setting. But still, many will be unable to accept them. He states truly "the primary purpose of the Church," and deals faithfully with its failures. Much attention is devoted to the question of authority in the Church, and it is maintained that such authority is by no means opposed to free thought, scientific truths, or criticism. But it is *there*, all the same, and, with the intellectually "alarming" list of beliefs to be received (all said to be implied in the Bible doctrine of God and man) it would prove "a yoke that neither our fathers nor we were able to bear."

Dr. Gore writes also with special interest on *reunion*; he hopes that he may induce such a fresh and unbiased study of the Christian writings and history as may, in time, lead to such agreement in beliefs as will make reunion possible. But it is to be feared that real Christian union can never come about through agreement in beliefs in "Creed and Church." If, as he affirms, Christianity is primarily a *life*, what more should be required? He says also, truly, that no one whom Jesus would have received should be rejected, and that Christ leads us to *God*. And, if the Holy Spirit is "the life of the Church," is not that Spirit God, and is not God holy unifying Love?

An earnest plea is made for such ethical revival in all the Churches as would bring about "co-operative effort even at once."

W. L. WALKER.

The Philosophy of Religious Experience. By ERIC S. WATERHOUSE, M.A., D.D. The Epworth Press. 6s.

Dr. Waterhouse has given us a singularly competent and stimulating book. It is suggestive throughout, and even where least convincing—as in the section on "The Challenge of Evil" and the references to mystics and mysticism—it is open-eyed and frank.

The strength of the author's contention is manifested in his firm belief that the religious postulate is a hypothesis by means of which mankind has met life and lived it—in spite of the serious difficulties which it encounters from the intellectual standpoint. Starting with the belief that what is most widely characteristic of human life is the most important material for philosophy, the emphasis is laid on the place and importance of religion—"the belief in an other-than-human order, or God, held to be in existence and in relation to man." The attempt is made to examine "collective experience," to discover what holds good of religious experience as a whole. This is summed up as "the idea of God, or gods, and of a relation between the divine and the human."

The purely subjective view of religious experience is rejected, as also the suggestion that it referred to the action of society upon the individual. The author's philosophical treatment is specially clear and convincing. Dr. Waterhouse contends that "philosophically considered, religious experience as a whole must be understood as implying a predication concerning the nature of reality; that there was in reality a principle sympathetic to human good in its completest sense." This he calls the religious postulate. The question whether this postulate could be regarded as holding

ood, and was capable of entering into the synthesis of our knowledge s a valid assertion concerning reality, is discussed with admirable clearness nd skill. Dr. Waterhouse holds that the principal need of the present ime is that philosophy should attempt a systematization of all experience ather than content itself with a strictly metaphysical function—though e is well aware of the difficulties of such a task. He insists that the *data* or philosophy must include human values. The character of reality is onceived accordingly—moving from value to existence. Whether the uthor establishes his contention that the general facts of religious experience rovide the essential groundwork for a philosophy of religion may be lebated; but no one will question the soundness of the assertion that ' no ultimate contradiction of any of our interests, æsthetic and moral s well as intellectual, would allow us to rest satisfied." The whole essay leserves careful study. It is written in a lucid and engaging style, and he patient thought and humility of the scholar are united with a refreshing rankness and fearlessness.

W. Major Scott.

The Development of Berkeley's Philosophy. By G. A. Johnston, M.A., D.Phil. Macmillan. 8s. 6d.

Berkeley's Philosophy cannot be adequately interpreted without this ook, which is a noteworthy contribution to the History of Philosophy n England in the eighteenth century. The development in every branch f Berkeley's Philosophy is traced (mathematics and ethics are not neglected), nd many original and convincing suggestions are made. To instance a ew such points:

The meaning of the very first sentence in the "Principles" is shown o have been consistently misunderstood: the significance of the Theory f Vision is discovered to lie in its insistence upon judgment as the real nit of knowledge; much light is thrown on the doctrine of "Sign and hing signified" by a study of mathematical advances in the previous alf-century, and here as elsewhere can be seen the effect of Berkeley's im "to abridge the labour of study." A discussion of the rare and eglected work of John Sergeant in his *Solid Philosophy* is made to throw urther light on Berkeley, and is a piece of valuable research in itself.

The suggestive study of the influence of Locke upon Berkeley's early 'articularism raised the expectation of a study of Plato's influence upon is late Spiritual Realism, where "esse" becomes "concipi." The absence f this is not very serious, and it is the only criticism we have to make of book made delightful to read by the writer's clear thinking and easy tyle.

Cyril H. Valentine.

Cosmology, an Introduction to the Philosophy of Matter. Vol. I: **The Greeks and the Aristotelian Schoolmen.** By John O'Neill, D.Ph. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

A witty and interesting introduction precedes a lengthy and learned issertation on the History of Cosmological Speculation, which begins with 'hales and will end (in Vol. II) with Einstein. The book is written as pologetic and propaganda, and as such it is remarkably clever. The uthor believes that Theism depends on Cosmology, and this must mean hat Roman Catholic doctrine depends upon a particular theory of the

nature of matter, viz. the scholastic philosophy as revised and edited by St. Thomas Aquinas. Christian Theism, fortunately, does not depend upon any particular theory of the nature of matter, and if Roman Catholic doctrine is only safe in the setting of Thomist Cosmology, that seems to be an exposure of its insecurity. The author, however, is convinced "that contemporary Scholasticism" (which means, of course, Aquinas revised) "embodies the best attested results of modern science and modern Philosophy."

CYRIL H. VALENTINE.

Jesus and Civil Government. By A. T. CADOUX, B.A., D.D. Allen & Unwin. 6s.

This book by Dr. Cadoux (to be distinguished from Dr. C. J. Cadoux, his brother) is a "war" book—in two senses. It is, in its main purport, an essay in Christian justification of war; and it is obviously, and confessedly, the outcome of a seething in the author's mind which the late war occasioned. It is a painstaking piece of work. Dr. Cadoux, it may fairly be said, leaves no part of the New Testament which bears upon his subject unexamined, unless we count the rather surprising omission of any reference to the passage about sending not peace but a sword—an omission which is to his credit as an anti-pacifist. He boldly challenges the pacifist on every one of his favourite standing-grounds in exegesis or in ethics, and he makes out as good a case against him on most points as we have yet seen. Those who want to have it demonstrated to them that their scruples against supporting or taking part in war have no foundation in Christ's teaching or in a reasonable philosophy of human social development will find this a comforting book.

The argument, gathered into one simple syllogism, is this: Jesus approved of civil government; civil government involves of necessity coercion, which under certain circumstances must take the form of war; therefore Jesus approved of war. It does not differ radically from Mozley's argument, in his famous University sermon on War, that Christianity, since it accepts the Nation, must accept and tolerate the armed conflicts which the existence of nations will from time to time involve. But Dr. Cadoux takes us step by step on the road of this argument, with determination to give us no chance of halting or turning back. He gives us as fair a statement as he can at each point of all possible objections he has heard. No scrap of the Sermon on the Mount escapes his scrutiny; it is not brushed aside, it is bit by bit swept into the service of his demonstration. The temptation of our Lord, the example of His life, the motive of His death—all are examined and all found to yield corroboration of the main thesis. The limitations of the non-resistance teaching—part of it being concerned only to recommend a method of dealing with minor wrongs where no third party is involved, part of it adapted only to vocational specialists—are made so clear that he who fights may read that teaching without disturbance. And we are shown by a review of all past history that our social and moral and religious inheritance would have been impossible without the contribution made to it by coercive violence, including war.

One of the most interesting, and, we think, original, parts of the book is that in which Dr. Cadoux explains the famous "two swords" passage—that troublesome bone for controversialists on this subject. He finds that Jesus, foiled in His expectation that the Jewish people would accept His teaching and would go forward in His Church to witness to the truth among the nations with no need of carnal weapons, rescinded His first programme

of peaceful penetration, and called on His disciples to be ready, in the matter both of property and of arms, to take their part in the "strong government" which (contrary to His hope) was still needed before the world could be ripe for the Kingdom. The passage, to which a bald summary cannot do justice, is a good example of the writer's honest thoroughness of ingenuity. His conclusion that "the dark ages would have been less dark and the dawn would have come sooner and more brightly if the followers of Jesus had understood this command" is certainly immensely provocative of thought. Some of us have believed that the darkness, which has not yet passed away, has been rather due to the ignoring by the followers of Jesus of His much plainer commands in a different direction.

In the last chapter of the book, which deals with "Modern Conditions," there are some crumbs of comfort for the pacifist. He will be partially reassured when he learns that there are considerations which will make a good man "chary of advising war even of the most chivalrous sort," and he will be encouraged by Dr. Cadoux's assertion that "war is at this time of day an obsolete schoolmaster likely only to teach his pupils much that they will have to unlearn in better schools than his." But the book ends with an uneasy, argued warning that the increase of pacifism would result in the utmost prolongation of war, tempered by a happier expression of confidence that its spread will not be rapid, since it has shown nothing like the rapidity of the anti-slave movement. The loaf of comfort, as was said, is for the other people.

This is such a careful, honest, well-intentioned and able book, that we hesitate to say—what must be said, if the reviewer's part is to be honestly done—that it seems a singularly useless one. There are many among us who dare to hope that this century will be looked back upon as the one in which the men of all nations learned to abandon the practice of war, with its cruelty, misery, demoralization and waste. This latest Christian apologist for war himself admits that war will not be ended by any proof that it does not pay; he puts that down to the world's moral credit. But how will it be ended? Ultimately and fundamentally, we are persuaded, by nothing except the conviction, coming more and more to possess the minds of men and of nations, that it is *wrong*. That conviction of the wrongness of war will no doubt piece by piece create a machinery which will appear to obviate its necessity; but it is the moral vision, translated into a practical faith, which will be the moving power. Courts of law came to be because people saw that fighting out their quarrels was wrong; it was not the courts that came first. And an international tribunal will not come first—it will come as the product of a conviction that war is unspeakably wrong. And who should lead in this vision if not the disciples of Christ? Does not the world wait for there to be enough men who say "this thing is an abomination, accursed in the sight of God," in order that *another way* shall be found. Dr. Cadoux's repeated reference to the natural repugnance to such methods as are used in war which is characteristic of the Christian, indicates that he is farther than he thinks on the road to the pacifism which he so fears.

As an analytic exposition, a rationalization, of the mentality of the average nominal Christian in the matter of war, this book is admirable. With most of its argument in defence of civil government, involving such ways of coercion and restraint and penalization as are prompted by sane and loving concern for individual and social good, few of us will be disposed to quarrel. We see those ways improving year by year, under the inspiration of Christian teaching, through the service and sacrifice of men who dare to stand in a minority to advocate their vision of right. Dr. Cadoux

says, "if coercion is an essentially wrong way of dealing with crime, we should expect the penal system inevitably to deteriorate, for that which is essentially evil can develop only by becoming more patently so." The penal system, he sees, is improving. Can he think the same is true of war? What about non-combatants, blockades, submarines, air-raids, poison-gas? Dr. Cadoux's argument certainly here recoils upon himself.

If we begin with facts as they are and seek to justify them, we may be content with the interpretation of the words of the New Testament which this book gives us. If we start with a judgment upon those facts provided for us by the Christ whom that New Testament reveals, we shall be profoundly discontented with any view of war and the Christian attitude towards it which does not make a far more revolutionary call upon our faith and courage.

H. C. CARTER.

Race Problems in the New Africa. By W. C. WILLOUGHBY. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 15s.

By his long residence in Central and South Africa, and by his diligent study of the natives, Mr. Willoughby is well qualified to write a book of this kind. Like many other writers in these days, he insists upon the necessity of a full knowledge of Bantu religion and social institutions for those who seek to govern and teach. So, before he discusses the problems arising out of the contact of white and black, he describes the life and beliefs of the people, and this part of his book is as well-informed as the other is sane and helpful. Mission Boards would do well to see that every missionary on their staff possessed this book; still better, to make it a text-book for their students; best of all, to study it themselves and propagate its contents.

One hesitates to differ from a writer of Mr. Willoughby's experience, but while cordially in agreement with his main positions I must register my disagreement in some points. The book does not deal with all Africans, but only with the Bantu; not with all Bantu, but, as the sub-title indicates, only with those living under British rule. Even so, I think Mr. Willoughby is inclined to generalize too freely, and this leads him to over-simplify some matters. Marriage, for example. He seems to confuse "matrilineal marriage" with matrilocal—a term he does not use. The two things are not the same; there are some tribes which are "matrilineal" and not "matrilocal." I cannot agree with the author in seeing nothing but animism (apart from theism) in Bantu religion. My studies lead me to believe that African taboos and charms cannot be explained without the use of the word "mana," which is quite distinct from "soul." In short, I consider that much of Bantu religion is pre-animistic.

But these are matters about which one cannot dogmatize in the present state of our knowledge. And my hesitation to accept Mr. Willoughby's conclusions on these points does not detract from my sense of the value of his admirable work.

EDWIN W. SMITH.

The Complete Poems of Charlotte Brontë.—The Complete Poems of Emily Jane Brontë. Edited by CLEMENT SHORTER. Hodder. 10s. 6d. each.

Haworth is a large manufacturing village, bleak and remote, which had the Rev. Patrick Brontë as vicar for over forty years. But strange glamour

ngs round his parsonage, which sheltered the only educated household the parish. As Thackeray wrote : " What a story is that of the family poets in their solitude yonder on the gloomy Yorkshire moors ! " The ree sisters—Charlotte, Emily and Anne Brontë—made their home famous. ıe youngest might have been forgotten, except as the author of two or ree hymns which survive in not a few collections. But so great a judge Swinburne described Charlotte Brontë as " a woman of the first order genius," while he did not hesitate to place Emily higher still. They ɔn their fame as novelists rather than poets, and it must be confessed at Charlotte's poems seldom rise much above mediocrity. Emily Brontë, ɔwever, composed stanzas like *The Old Stoic*, which will last as long as ıglish literature. Her poems show remarkable force and vigour, as well deep feeling ; and one supreme piece, *No Coward Soul is Mine*—the st she ever wrote—must rank among the noblest verses ever written by woman.

All Brontë enthusiasts will be grateful for these two sumptuous volumes, ıich are edited by Mr. Clement Shorter. No living man of letters excels m in exhaustive knowledge of everything that relates to the Brontës and eir books ; and his own library contains a wonderful store of published d unpublished Brontë MSS. Under such auspices we have here the ɔst complete and accurate editions imaginable. The collation, biblio- aphy and notes have been carried out by Mr. C. W. Hatfield with rupulous care, while the *format* and facsimiles are beyond praise.

T. H. Darlow.

HORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST

'E are glad to have the five volumes of Mr. R. B. Morgan's *Readings in ıglish Social History* in one well-illustrated volume (Cambridge University ress, 16s). To illustrate life in England from pre-Roman days to 1837, r. Morgan has drawn on many varied sources, and he manages to convey readers the social customs of different centuries. His volume will be welcome addition to the resources of teachers and students.

To the worker among historical documents Mr. Frederick Chamberlin's *he Sayings of Queen Elizabeth* (Bodley Head, 16s.) will seem to have about a good deal of the amateur. The introduction has the amateur's usual aim to a " find " of tremendous importance, while the violence of the tack on Froude (whose limitations students long since recognized) uts Mr. Chamberlin out of court as a writer of scientific history. In this ɔok, as in *The Private Life of Queen Elizabeth*, Mr. Chamberlin renders eful service in pointing out facts and features that have often been erlooked, but he should not lose his sense of proportion by magnifying ese so that they blot out all else in heaven and history. It should be ssible for us to admit that Elizabeth was a very clever woman without preciating the work and wisdom of Burghley. The collection of sayings of course, interesting, though one never knows under what section to ɔk for a particular item (the sayings are arranged, not chronologically, ıt under headings like " My People," " Frugality," " Ambassadors," Random Flashes "), and the frequent lack of references is not what one ɔuld expect after Mr. Chamberlin's strictures on other writers. Such ferences he calls " disfigurements," and he apologizes for " injecting "

some hundreds of them into the book. We hope that the promised life of Leicester is being written in scholarly fashion, with all the violence and prejudice omitted, and their place taken by authorities and references.

Those who have worked through Dr. H. Osborn Taylor's larger books—*Ancient Ideals*, *The Mediæval Mind*, and *Thought and Expression in the Sixteenth Century*—will know what to expect in this smaller *Freedom of the Mind in History* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.). Dr. Taylor believes that "progress, the increase of human well-being," is "the achievement of human faculty and the divine power. It seems to me to issue from the unfolding of the free energies of the human mind empowered and sustained by the creative will of God." The activity of the mind is traced from the beginning of organic life down to the present, and the concluding chapter deals with "the prospect."

A Short History of American Literature (edited by W. P. Trent, J. Erskine, S. P. Sherman, and Carl van Doren. Cambridge University Press, 15s.) is an abridgment of the four-volume *History*. It is a useful piece of work, though the chapters are of varying merit, and often the proportion seems open to criticism: most people on this side will feel that too much space is given to Poe, and that, while the article on Lincoln is a most interesting psychological study, it is out of place in a *History of Literature*. Some of the essays are very well done. There are one or two misprints, which is unusual in a Cambridge Press book.

Mr. E. E. Kellett of the Leys School has a way with him, whether he writes of N.T., classical, or literary subjects. Half the essays in *Suggestions* (Cambridge University Press, 7s. 6d.) deal with Shakespeare, and the rest with such literary subjects as "Macaulay's Lay Figures," "The Literary Detective," etc.

All those engaged in the writing, production, and selling of books will turn with interest to Ambassador Page's *A Publisher's Confessions* (Heinemann, 5s.). They will find the judgments of an alert and vigorous mind set forth in clear, concise fashion, not without humour. Originally written for the *Boston Transcript*, the articles are now re-published by Mr. Page's partner. There is some repetition, but all authors, editors, and publishers can learn much from them.

Northern Neighbours (Hodder, 7s. 6d.) contains vivid sketches by Dr. W. T. Grenfell of life on the Labrador. These thrilling accounts should inspire many to support Dr. Grenfell's magnificent work.

It is encouraging to have from Canada a scholarly book like Professor F. G. Vial's *Three Measures of Meal* (Milford, 10s. 6d.), for the Colonies have the reputation of being obscurantist in matters Biblical and theological. It is unfortunate that the title does not suggest either the subject or the value of the book. The "three measures" are the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Roman, and the author's purpose is to show the reaction of the world on the Church.

Professor A. W. Ahl's *Bible Studies in the Light of Recent Research* (Luzac, 13s.) is intended as a "manual for higher institutions of learning and thoughtful Bible Students." There are brief chapters on the Bible, and on each book. The standpoint is conservative—Moses wrote the Pentateuch, Paul the Pastorals, and it is very doubtful whether there was a Deutero-Isaiah.

Far more satisfactory are two little books written for special purposes. Major J. W. Povah's *Study of the Old Testament* (Longmans, 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.) is an attempt to popularize Biblical knowledge, especially for Church Tutorial Classes. Canon Box writes a foreword. The Headmaster of Eton's *Why we read the Old Testament* (Bell, 1s. 6d.) is "a study of the

development of the idea of God among the Jews," suitable for a two-term course for Fifth-form boys. There are questions at the end.

The Bible Doctrine of Womanhood, by Dr. C. Ryder Smith (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.), is a handy collection of evidence relating to the position of women, tracing the three stages when woman was a means of pleasure, a means of family, and a personality. Dr. Smith sometimes uses words in an unusual way—e.g. " A harem is the system's utter practice "—but in this and a parallel volume, *The Bible Doctrine of Wealth and Work* (Epworth Press, 6s.), he has done useful spade-work. In an epilogue to the latter work he concludes that Capitalism, Socialism, and Syndicalism alike fall short of the Christian ideal.

It is safe to say that the world has never seen an exposition of the Lord's Prayer like the Rev. G. A. Studdert Kennedy's *The Wicket Gate* or *Plain Bread* (Hodder, 6s.). It has been said that the whole of systematic theology is implicit in the Lord's Prayer. " Woodbine Willie " gets out of it a great deal that is neither systematic nor theology—psycho-analysis, currency, and a thousand and one things ! But he is good reading. He is in dead earnest, and tackles life as it is. His introductory chapter, especially, is a fine tonic.

The Rev. G. R. H. Shafto, having dealt with the parables of Jesus, turns, in *The Wonders of the Kingdom* (Student Christian Movement, 4s. 6d. and 3s.), to the miracles. He sets out, not to " explain " the miracles, but to " marshal the facts." There are chapters dealing with the different categories of miracles and " Some Conclusions as to the Methods and Conditions of the Gospel Miracles."

The Minister and His Greek New Testament (Hodder, 7s. 6d.) is Dr. A. T. Robertson's twenty-seventh book, the fruits of thirty-five years' teaching experience. His enthusiasm for the Greek N.T. lights up all that he writes, sketches of " John Brown of Haddington " and " Broadus as Scholar and Preacher," and articles on subjects like " Pictures in Prepositions," and even inclines us to forgive him for " the N.T. use of Μή with Hesitant Questions in the Indicative Mood." There is a bad misprint on p. 115.

Mr. James Baikie has done good work in popularizing knowledge of the East and ancient times, and there will be a warm welcome for his well-illustrated *Century of Excavation in the Land of the Pharaohs* (R.T.S., 7s. 6d.). Mr. Baikie has much that is interesting to say on a fascinating and a topical subject ; he might have considerably increased the value of the volume by the addition of a map and a chronological table.

In *Concerning Christ* (Heffer, 3s. 6d.), Dr. A. H. McNeile has given us another sane little book. Twenty-four addresses have been arranged to throw light on the earthly life of Jesus, Passion Week, and the Atonement.

Dean Inge's *Personal Religion and the Life of Devotion* (Longmans, 2s. 6d.) is as charming as it is suggestive. In it the many sides of the writer's mind are plainly visible : at the beginning we see the mystic and student of Plotinus ; in the chapters on faith, hope, and joy the Christian preacher ; in the chapter on the world we get a glimpse of the caustic controversialist ; and at the end (and in the Latin dedication) the account of the life and last days of little Paula show the devoted parent.

Everything that President Henry Churchill King writes is worth careful consideration, and these Deems Lectures on *Seeing Life Whole* (New York : Macmillan Co., 7s.) are no exception. In this " Christian Philosophy of Life " President King deals with what he calls the scientific, the psychological, the value, the personal and ethical, the philosophical, and the Biblical and Christian approach. The lectures are marked by wide

reading—indeed, our one criticism is that the quotations are rather too numerous—and sound common sense ; they are not always easy to read, but young people could not fail to benefit by pondering on them.

The Rev. Charles Magraw's *The Problem of Human Immortality* (Skeffington, 2s.) is a thoughtful little book, defending the doctrine of personal immortality, especially against materialist attacks.

In *Some Aspects of Christian Belief* (Hodder, 7s. 6d.) Dr. H. R. Mackintosh gathers together from *The Expositor* and other journals fourteen essays written at various times during the last fifteen years. They deal, in the main, with philosophical and historical theology, and they have more than ephemeral value. We are glad to have them in book form.

Dr. H. T. Hodgkin's writings are generally so fresh and suggestive that we are sorry to say that we found *The Way of Jesus* (Student Movement, 4s. and 2s. 6d.) disappointing. The book, which is an attempt to discover from the N.T. "the way of Jesus for human society," is on the "Fosdick" plan, with reading and comments for each day, and general notes and questions at the end of the week. Somehow the plan does not quite "come off," and we have got less from this than from any previous book of the writer.

Dr. Orchard's *The Foundations of Faith* (Allen and Unwin, 5s.) is the first of a series of four. It is labelled "Theological," but there is no indication of the titles of the forthcoming volumes. We hope to deal with the four together.

In *The Friendship of God* (Putnams, 3s. 6d.) we have another volume of Miss Maude Royden's addresses. The ten here printed include Miss Royden's first sermon and two inspiring studies of Joan of Arc and Charles Darwin.

A Statement of Faith (Birkenhead S.S.U., 2d.) consists of questions and answers concerning Christian doctrine. It has been prepared by the Rev. H. Bulcock for the local Sunday School Union for the use of teachers and elder scholars. It is careful, reverent, and modern.

The Abiding Presence (Student Christian Movement, 3s.) is a volume of meditations and intercessions (for India, China, and Africa).

Many Christians, including ministers who would like to exercise the ministry of healing, are altogether perplexed by the wordy warfare of the times about psycho-analysis, auto-suggestion, faith-healing, Christian Science, and the rest. They could not do better than turn for guidance to the Rev. Harold Anson's *Spiritual Healing* (University of London Press, 3s. 6d.), in which the Chairman of the Board of Health deals in his usual thorough fashion with the subject—and in its fullest content, not merely healing, or mental healing, but spiritual healing. Mr. Anson has given us a wise and timely book. With it should be read the Report of the Archbishop's Committee on *The Ministry of Healing* (S.P.C.K., 6d.).

Eyeless Sight (Putnam, 5s.) is an interim statement in which M. Jules Romains describes experiments in support of the view that men can see without using their eyes. This power of extra-retinal vision lies in the skin, and M. Romains describes many demonstrations, witnessed by M. Anatole France and others, where patients saw by means of this paroptic perception. The author claims that trained subjects can, by means of these minute eyes in the skin, read at almost normal speed, and suggests that the safety of sleep-walkers is due to the use of this faculty. Apparently the medical profession in France is sceptical, and so we must await further evidence.

It will be a pity if Mrs. Eyles, who can write serviceably and well, becomes a mere bookmaker. She has really nothing to say in *Family*

Love (Melrose, 4s. 6d.), which deals with a subject about which far too much is being written. Sometimes, if she uses words in their usual sense, her statements are quite contrary to fact—witness that about boys after the age of puberty on p. 88. One of the best things in the book is the description of how she and her husband, resolved to give their children right ideas of parenthood,

> " decided never to quarrel or chip each other before the children—but to make a solemn appointment with each other in private if we felt a quarrel was inevitable. And, by so doing, we usually find that the quarrel evaporates into thin air."

Some of Mr. Richard King's essays in *Folded Hands* (Hodder, 6s.) are rather thin, but in the main they are well written and often amusing. The most ordinary scene serves to start him off, and there is no guessing where he will end, but he observes men and women (especially women) very acutely, and often by a striking turn of phrase sums up a situation.

Realities and Shams (Williams and Norgate, 6s.) reprints essays of Dr. L. P. Jacks written during the last few years. Dr. Jacks generally probes deep, and all social workers should ponder his remarks on education, democracy, and leadership.

In his *Studies in the Christian Gospel for Society* (Student Christian Movement, 6s.) Mr. H. A. Mess has given us a searching and stimulating book, in which sound common sense is combined with intimate knowledge of the life of the people. His main thesis is that the world looks to the Church for guidance in social problems, and the Church, through her representatives, gives no certain sound and no clear guidance—because *she has not thought enough.* " If as much scholarship had been put into thinking out a Christian social order as has gone to the elucidation of the Synoptic problem or to the dating of the books of the O.T., we should not be in our present weak position."

The Prevention of War (Yale and Oxford University Presses, 10s. 6d.) consists of six lectures at the Institute of Politics, Williamstown, by two Britishers, Philip Kerr and Lionel Curtis. Mr. Kerr, from his intimate knowledge of the conduct of the war and the making of the peace, has concluded that there is no security against war while sovereign states exist. All means to prevent war must fail if there is not a world organization standing to those states as the Federal Government stands to the forty-eight United States. Why should not a man be a citizen " of the city of Boston, of the state of Massachusetts, of the Republic of the United States, and of the commonwealth of the world ? " Mr. Curtis, having outlined the history of the Union in South Africa and of responsible government in India, comes to the same conclusion as Mr. Kerr, illustrating from the British Commonwealth.

Outward Bound, by Sutton Vane (Chatto & Windus, 5s. and 3s. 6d.), is the play that has been running at several London theatres this winter. Passengers on board a vessel do not know where they are going, and discover that they are dead. The visit of the Examiner and the attitude of the passengers to him is as amusing as it is interesting, and the whole play is calculated to give one furiously to think.

NEW EDITIONS

The following books have deservedly gone into new editions :

Professor W. E. Hocking's very thorough *Human Nature and its Remaking* (Yale and Oxford University Presses, 18s.) takes account of recent Freudian discussions, Dewey's *Human Nature and Conduct*, etc.

Dr. RUFUS JONES's *Social Law in the Spiritual* (Swarthmore Press, 3rd edition, 4s. 6d.).
Canon E. S. WOOD's *Modern Discipleship* (5th edition, entirely revised. Student Christian Movement, 5s.).
Dr. R. C. T. EVANS's *Man: What? Whence? Whither?* (Chatham: Parrett and Neves, 3s. 6d. and 2s.).
Mr. W. E. WILSON's *Atonement and Non-Resistance* (Swarthmore Press, 2s.).
Mr. FRANK PODMORE's *Robert Owen* (2 vols. in one, 46 illustrations, Allen & Unwin, 16s.).
Miss JANE ADDAMS' *Twenty Years at Hull House* (Macmillan's Pocket Classics, 10s.).

We have also received:

Third Baptist World Congress, Stockholm, 1923. Report of Proceedings. Edited by W. T. WHITLEY, M.A., LL.D. Introduction by J. H. Shakespeare, M.A., D.D. Kingsgate Press, 10s. 6d.).
F. A. FAWKES: *The Riddle of Life after Death* (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.).
G. E. HORR: *The Christian Faith and Eternal Life* (Ingersoll Lecture) (Harvard and Oxford University Presses, 4s. 6d.).
T. A. LACEY: *Ultimate Salvation* (S.P.C.K., 2s.).
J. NEIL: *Peeps into Palestine* (Stanley Martin, 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d.).
J. GORDON HUTTON: *Daily Leading* (Hodder, 2s. 6d.).
G. T. SADLER: *The Husk and the Kernel of the Pauline Gospel* (St. Catherine Press, 1s.).
H. T. CHILVERS: *But Jesus Answered* (Stanley Martin, 2s. 6d.).
H. WILSON: *Jesus at School* (S.S.U., 2s. 6d.).
A. H. SMALL: *The Kingdom and the King according to Luke. The Kingdom and the King according to John* (Student Christian Movement, 4s. and 2s. 6d each).
T. STEPHENSON: *The Fourfold Evangel* (Sharp, 2s. 6d.).
J. E. STUART: *Highways and Byways in the Spiritual Life* (Longmans, 6s.).
J. A. THOMSON: *The New Natural History* (Milford, 1s.) (Boyle Lecture.)
Anglican Evangelical Group Movement Pamphlets. Edited by G. H. HARRIS and V. F. STORR (Hodder, 3d. each).
W. T. MAXWELL: *Roads to Success* (Williams & Norgate, 1s.).

PERIODICALS

The Holborn (Jan.). The Editor reprints from the *Rylands Library Bulletin* the first part of "The Roots of Hebrew Prophecy and Jewish Apocalyptic," and also discusses the life of "Prophet Baxter." Professor Wardle writes on the Gadd tablet, and Professor Bompas Smith outlines study courses on education. There is a short note on "Science and Religion" by the late Emile Boutroux; the Rev. J. H. Ward writes lucidly on "The Rights of Conscience," and the Rev. G. S. Hooson deals with Goethe's "Faust." The number is strong on the practical side—there are two articles dealing with politics and another with capital punishment. The Editor is assisted by an efficient staff of reviewers in "Current Literature."

The Hibbert (Jan.). The Editor's "Alternative to Government by Talk" is followed—appropriately—by Mr. J. D. Morgan's suggestive "The Ethics of Engineering." Mrs. C. E. Couling compares Taoism with "New Thought," Sir Arthur Newsholme writes on Social Hygiene, and Mr. and Mrs. A. D. Lindsay, very wisely, on Birth Control. Congregationalism is represented by Dr. A.

Duff's "Spiritual Legacy of Egypt." Mr. Carleton Stanley concludes (we hope) a discussion on Canadian Life, which has not added to the *Hibbert's* dignity. Welcome contrasts are Professor Weinel's very valuable article on "The Present State of Religious Life in Germany" and Dr. Moffatt's "Survey of Recent Theological Literature."

The Pilgrim (Jan.). An interesting number. The Editor's "Gambling and Ethics" is more convincing than his "Editorial Notes"! Mr. F. E. Pollard writes a very useful article on "National Power and Christian Purpose," and Dr. H. T. Hodgkin continues his discussion of "World Reconstruction." The Friends are well represented, and many readers will turn first to see what Mr. H. G. Wood has to say on "The Religious Value of Outward Continuity." The Bishop of Ripon has a lecture on "The Holy Catholic Church." Other articles are by Miss Florence Nevill and Mr. A. E. Baker.

The London Quarterly (Jan.). The Editor writes on Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman and on Dr. Pullan's Bampton Lectures. The Rev. E. J. Bradford's informing article, "The Great Reaction," concludes that Mussolini "seems to have a long period of power before him." The Rev. A. W. Harrison has a timely (and indignant) article on "Methodism and Anglo-Catholicism," and Mr. T. F. Lockyer deals with "The Churchmanship of John Wesley." Mr. T. H. S. Escott's "Westmorland to Wimbledon" is a weird jumble, but there are other very interesting articles.

The Baptist Quarterly (Jan.) has a portrait of Dr. Clifford, papers on the psychology of revivals (Rev. T. Phillips), on "The Place of English in the Theological Curriculum" (Dr. Dakin) and on "The Renaissance of Worship" (T. Frankin Chambers). It is interesting to note that at last a modern Baptist has challenged the oft-repeated statement that there is no connexion between the English Baptists and the Continental Anabaptists. We hope Professor Farrer will pursue the point further.

The Modern Churchman (Dec.–Feb.). The Modernists in the Church of England have recently suffered heavy losses; these numbers have appreciations of Cyril Emmet, Miss Dougall, and A. Clutton Brock. The main topics discussed are Prayer-Book Revision in the Church of England and the attack on Modernists in the Episcopal Church in the United States.

The Church Quarterly Review (Jan.) opens with Mr. Barker's article on 'Shakespeare and Nature." The Rev. W. J. Ferrar gives a very useful summary in "Psychology and Religion," and Miss Hilda Johnstone describes from records a year in Henry III's life. Dr. Relton discusses Dean Matthew's *The Idea of Revelation*, the Rev. C. S. Carter the Elizabethan Religious Settlement, Professor Compston "Old Testament Folk-lore and Fact," and Dr. Jacob "Scholasticism and Personality in the Eighteenth Century."

The Interpreter (Jan.). The Editor discusses Goguel's *Acts*, Dr. T. H. Robinson Sellin's *Old Testament*, and Dr. Nairne and the Rev. R. G. Parsons aspects of Prayer Book Revision. Dr. Dearmer begins a series of sketches—"The Acts of Jesus," and there are three articles on fellowship—past, present, and future—by Miss Bousfield, Mr. A. W. Pollard, and the Rev. J. R. Mozley. Dr. Duff writes on "The Actual Story of Isaiah."

The Expository Times (Jan.–March). Dr. Edward Lyttelton writes on "Education and Religion," Dr. Rendel Harris on "St. Paul and Æschylus." Sermons by Rev. A. J. Gossip, Dr. J. D. Jones, and Dr. Hutton. Dr. Selbie draws attention to the work of Dr. J. W. Hauer, a former Mansfield student now lecturing in Tübingen.

The Expositor (Jan.—Feb.). We welcome Dr. Jas. Moffatt to the editorial chair. He has so far had a good list of contributors, including Congregationalists like the Rev. S. Tonkin and Dr. Sydney Cave; the book reviewing, however, seems to be confined to Scotsmen! A series of articles on "The Ten Best Books" on various subjects is an interesting feature.

The Review of the Churches (Jan.). Sir H. S. Lunn has given this Review a new lease of life in order to deal with problems arising out of his Mürren Conference, and, especially, with Reunion. He himself contributes several articles, and he has many well-known names on his title page. The *Review* treats of matters of practical interest rather than with theology or literature. Dr. W. C.

Poole writes a useful summary on "Prohibition in the United States." There are signs of haste in the editing—Mr. Kirk's initials, for example, appear as E.C., P.T.R., and P.A.T.

The Friends' Quarterly Examiner (First Month) is not so interesting as usual. Historical articles include Mr. Edward Grubb's "Evangelicalism and Friends," and there is the first part of a long review of Sir William Harcourt's *Life* by Mr. T. E. Harvey, M.P. Miss Maude Robinson has a charming sketch: "Was it High Treason?"

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester (Jan.). A bulky number of 297 pages. Dr. Rendel Harris prints what he claims to be Tatian's lost *The Perfection of Discipleship*; Dr. Peake, after a fruitful discussion (and useful bibliography) concludes that Jesus believed Himself to be the Messiah. Professor Tout secures rather a disproportionate amount of space for the mediæval period, his own article, Mr. Wilkinson's, and Mr. Crump's very necessary warning about the use of records, taking sixty-eight pages. Nonconformists will be most interested in Dr. Powicke's paper—but what does *sub voce* mean on p. 175?—on Thomas Hall (a seventeenth-century divine whose library is now at Birmingham), and in Professor Herford's suggestive comparison of Dante and Milton. Mr. Hoskier continues the report of his examination of the MSS. of the Apocalypse, and Dr. Mingana translates an Arabic MS. in the library relating to India (1717–20).

The International Review of Missions (Jan.) shows how in India, Africa, Ceylon and China alike the demand for nationality is influencing missionary work. The Rev. W. H. T. Gairdner examines the claim that Islam is progressing more rapidly than Christianity in Africa, the Rev. W. C. Willoughby writes on Khama, and the Rev. E. Shillito on "The Missionary as Prophet." There is the usual bibliography, and the first number of the *Bulletin of the International Missionary Council* is added. This review is indispensable for students of Christian missions.

World Dominion (Dec.) has articles on Singapore, Ethiopia, Leprosy (Dr. Cochrane), Turkey, and on *Tested Methods*, the last named dealing with ways of getting people to church. The world survey deals with Russia and Germany as well as Oceania, India, and China.

The Yale Review (Jan.). The Editor writes an enthusiastic article on "The Humor of Max Beerbohm"; Kathleen Mansfield's Journal is continued; Mr. J. M. Murry discusses "Flaubert and Flaubart." Some letters of an occasional visitor to the Brownings in Florence do not tell us much. The Assistant Editor has an earnest plea for American support for the League of Nations. Other articles are Professor W. G. Sumner's "Modern Marriage" (written before 1907), and Mr. J. G. Fletcher's "The Spirit of Thomas Hardy."

The Review and Expositor (Baptist, Louisville, Kentucky, Jan.). Among the writers are Dr. Kyle M. Yates, Dr. Z. T. Cody, Professor H. H. Horne. The main subjects are the Stockholm Baptist Congress, and the Jubilee of Professors A. T. Robertson and J. R. Sampey.

The Harvard Theological Review (Jan.). The *pièce de résistance* is Professor Gustav Krüger's 50-page article on books on the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation published between 1914 and 1920. Dr. H. P. Smith writes on Sir J. G. Frazer's *Folk-lore in the Old Testament.*

[All books and periodicals reviewed in this Journal can be obtained from the Book-room of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, E.C.4.]